



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

CP26.10

~~KF686~~

~~CP.26.10~~

18. Aug. 1851.



57-86
9

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

VOLUME L.

FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XV.

JANUARY, MARCH, MAY, 1851.

BOSTON:
WM. CROSBY AND H. P. NICHOLS.
NEW YORK: C. S. FRANCIS & CO.
LONDON: JOHN CHAPMAN, 142 STRAND.
1851.

~~CP 26.10~~

CP 26.10

CAMBRIDGE:
METCALF AND COMPANY,
PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

21586
9

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE

PAGE

<i>184</i>	I. CONTEMPLATIONS OF GOD IN THE KOSMOS	1 ©
	II. THE ACADEMIES AND PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS OF MASSACHUSETTS	18
<i>184</i>	1. Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass. Ninth Annual Catalogue.	
<i>184</i>	2. Constitution of Williston Seminary at Easthampton, Mass.	
	3. Catalogue of the Trustees, Instructors, and Students of Lawrence Academy, Groton, Mass.	
	III. POETRY	46
	1. A Dark Morning.	
	2. The Last of the Strung Pearls.	
	3. Longing after the Contemplation of the Invisible. A Psalm.	
	4. Jesu Dulcis Memoria.	
	5. "He must increase, but I must decrease."	
<i>184</i>	IV. THE USES AND CAPABILITIES OF SUNDAY	55
	V. MEN BEFORE ADAM	79
<i>184</i>	1. Men before Adam. Or a Discourse upon the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth verses of the Fifth Chapter of the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans. By which are prov'd, That the first Men were created before Adam. London, Printed in the Year 1656.	
	2. Christian Examiner, No. CLVIII. pp. 181-204.	
	3. Christian Examiner, No. CLX. pp. 110-145.	
<i>184</i>	REFLECTIONS	96
	VII. DR. HOWE'S REPORTS UPON IDIOCY	103
<i>184</i>	1. A Report, in part, made by the Commissioners appointed under the Resolve of the 11th of April, 1846, "To inquire into the Condition of the Idiots of the Commonwealth; to ascertain their Number, and whether any Thing can be done for their Relief." Together with a Letter from George Sumner upon the Subject of the School for Idiots in Paris. Being House Document, No. 152. March 31, 1847.	

Humboldt's Religious Thoughts and Opinions,	147
New Manuals,	149
Books for the Season,	149

INTELLIGENCE.

<i>Literary Intelligence.</i> — English Unitarian Works . . .	153
<i>Religious Intelligence.</i> — London District Unitarian Society, — Dedication, — Installation, — Ordination, . .	154

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
<p>I. MEMOIR AND WRITINGS OF J. H. PERKINS The Memoir and Writings of James Handasyd Perkins. Edited by William Henry Channing.</p>	157
<p>II. COMTE'S POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY Cours de Philosophie Positive, par Auguste Comte, ancien Elève de l'Ecole Polytechnique, Répétiteur d'Analyse, etc.</p>	174
<p>III. UNITARIANISM IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES Antitrinitarian Biography: or Sketches of the Lives and Writings of distinguished Antitrinitarians; exhibiting a View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship in the principal Nations of Europe, from the Reformation to the Close of the Seventeenth Century. To which is prefixed a History of Unitarianism in England during the same Period. By Robert Wallace.</p>	202
<p>IV. SOUTHEY'S LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF ROBERT SOUTHEY The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey. Edit- ed by his Son, the Rev. Charles Cuthbert Southey.</p>	228
<p>V. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH</p>	254
<p>VI. THE ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY OF HARVARD UNI- VERSITY</p>	264
<p>VII. THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW ON HUNGARY 1. North American Review, January, 1850. "The War of Races in Hungary." 2. North American Review, April, 1850. "The Pol- itics of Europe." 3. North American Review, January, 1851. "The Rebellion of the Slavonic, Wallachian, and German Hungarians against the Magyars."</p>	279
<p>NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS. Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, — Anthon's Edition of Smith's New Classical Dictionary, — Andrews's Freund's Latin- English Lexicon,</p>	
	352

INTELLIGENCE.

Literary Intelligence. — Grote's History of Greece, —
Borrow's Lavengro, — Gilfillan's Bards of the Bible,
— Miss Lee's Poetical Remains, — The Dove and the
Eagle, — Abbot's Franconia Story, — Carpenter's Es-
say on Alcoholic Liquors, — Books in Press, . . . 363

Religious Intelligence. — A Chinese Proclamation on
Christianity, 365

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. PREACHING, AND THE AFTERNOON SERVICE	369
II. MASSACHUSETTS SANITARY SURVEY	381
Report of a General Plan for the Promotion of Public and Personal Health, devised, prepared, and recommended by the Commissioners appointed under a Resolve of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relating to a Sanitary Survey of the State. Presented April 25, 1850.	
III. "HE DESCENDED INTO HELL"	401
IV. INDIAN ANTIQUITIES IN NORTH AMERICA	417
1. Aboriginal Monuments of the State of New York, comprising the Results of Original Surveys and Explorations; with an Illustrative Appendix. By E. G. Squier, A. M. Accepted for Publication by the Smithsonian Institution, October 20th, 1849.	
2. League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois. By Lewis H. Morgan.	
V. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF DEATH AND LIFE	499
VI. POETRY	450
1. The Leipsic Tournament.	
2. The Loss of the Anio.	
3. In Memory of F. W. R.	
VII. EPIDEMIC MONOMANIA	457
1. De la Folie considérée sous le Point de Vue Pathologique, Philosophique, Historique, et Judiciaire, depuis la Renaissance des Sciences en Europe jusqu'au Dix-neuvième Siècle; Description des grandes Epidémies de Délire simple ou compliqué, qui ont atteint les Populations d'autrefois et régné dans les Monastères. Exposé des Condamnations auxquelles la Folie reconnue a souvent donné lieu. Par L. F. Calmeil.	
2. Sketch of the Epidemic Religious Monomania which occurred in Sweden in the Years 1841 and 1842. By S. Hanbury Smith, M. D.	
VIII. JANE BOUVERIE	478
Jane Bouverie; or Prosperity and Adversity. By Catherine Sinclair.	

IX. MISS MARTINEAU'S GOSPEL OF ATREISM	489
Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development. By Henry George Atkinson and Harriet Martineau.	
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.	
Knox on the Races of Men,	503
Borrow's Lavengro; the Scholar, the Gypsy, the Priest,	504
Lord's Poem, Christ in Hades,	506
De Quincey's Cæsars,	506
Lord Holland's Foreign Reminiscences,	507
Hawthorne's Twice-Told Tales, and House of the Seven Gables,	508
Tuckerman's Poems,	509
Sprague's Poetical and Prose Writings,	510
Brewer's Guide to 'Things Familiar,	511
M'Cosh's Method of the Divine Government,	511
Johnston's Notes on North America,	512
Bushnell's Christ in Theology,	513
Tuckerman's Characteristics of Literature,	514
Gayarre's Colonial History of Louisiana,	514
Goethe's Wilhelm Meister,	515
Lincoln's Edition of Horace,	515
Rev. N. Howe's Century Sermon,	516
Rev. Dr. Willard's Ethico-Political Tract,	516
Simms's Poem at Magnolia Cemetery,	516
Landon's Popery, British and Foreign,	517
INTELLIGENCE.	
<i>Literary Intelligence.</i> —The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review,—The Prospective Review,— New Publications and Works in Press,	517
<i>Religious Intelligence.</i> —The Pope,—The Hungarian Protestants,—The Revival of the Papal Hierarchy in England,	521
INDEX,	527

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

JANUARY, 1851.

ART. I.—CONTEMPLATIONS OF GOD IN THE KOSMOS. ©

THE special training through which every man passes, in preparation for the pursuit of that object, whatever it may be, which he has chosen as his aim in life, has more or less influence upon his appreciation of all general considerations and arguments. Notwithstanding the common foundation of all human intelligence, this diversity in the education of men must lead to such a different development of faculties which are in themselves essentially the same, that it may be said of almost any argument, that, while the train of evidence which it involves will be easily followed by some, it will be quite enigmatical to others. The widely different points of view from which men look on all important questions give rise to a general difficulty in introducing new arguments to bear upon subjects which have already been discussed, and often render it almost impossible to give them their true force and significance, or to make them tell, in their full meaning, what they naturally imply. This difficulty is particularly felt, when introducing evidence from the study of natural phenomena to elucidate questions of philosophy and natural theology. For the habit of discussing those subjects chiefly upon metaphysical grounds has prepared many to receive with indifference additional

evidence from physical sciences. This may be our apology for offering some considerations respecting the character of God, derived from the study of nature, and may, at the same time, explain the reluctance generally felt to such discussions. We trust, however, the time is not distant, when it will be universally understood that, to use the language of an eminent investigator in this field, "the battle of the evidences will have to be fought on the field of physical science and not on that of metaphysics"; and that the day may yet return when the study of metaphysical and physical science will be, as it was of old, more closely connected than it is at present.

Geology has shed so much light upon several points which were considered as the proper subjects of metaphysical inquiry, that the connection already acknowledged between these departments of learning will gradually become more intimate. The discussion respecting the origin of finite beings, so far, at least, as the decision of the fact that they have had a beginning, may be now considered at an end. For geology furnishes evidence, as ample as there can be upon any question, proving that all organized beings have been created at particular times, and have not, according to the theory of the atheist, an eternal, self-sustaining existence. There is even evidence that their appearance upon the stage of the world has not been simultaneous, but that there has been a regular succession in the introduction of physical and organic phenomena, ranging over an immense lapse of time. And it is to be hoped that astronomical investigations will finally settle, in an experimental way, the question of the age of matter. This question is the more important, as, from evidence derived from the study of our globe, there is no such thing to be found as matter proper, simple matter, capable of being transformed into particular bodies, but only material substances, each of which is endowed with specific properties, capable of combinations in determined proportions, and not liable to be transformed the one into the other,—thus presenting everywhere the character of specific finite existences,—that is, partaking of the general attributes which we recognize in created beings.

Before entering, however, into the investigation of the

question of creation, of the relations between the Creator and his works, it will not be out of place to mention the views of those who ascribe all the diversity which exists on earth to the action of laws established at its beginning. The argument generally introduced against this idea of a natural *development* is chiefly derived from the wonderful complications which organized beings especially evince, and from their perfect adaptation to the circumstances under which they live, indicating design. But though powerful in itself, this argument is not conclusive, inasmuch as laws may be conceived as involving a successive evolution. It seems to us, however, that in the character of organized beings themselves, in the repetition of the same combinations under different forms, living side by side, we have intrinsic evidence that their various kinds have each been the object of a special creative act, although we acknowledge that this evidence is of a kind to strike the naturalist more forcibly than the philosopher. The investigations which anatomists have been making within the last forty years, in order to ascertain the identity of structure in the different types of the animal kingdom belonging to the same natural divisions, have a direct reference to this question. To determine the homology of apparently different organs, to recognize the correspondence of diversely modified parts of the same system of organs, is in reality to trace the various forms of expression of the same thoughts.

Various kinds of corals growing promiscuously upon the same reef, presenting with permanent and unchanging specific differences an identical plan of structure, — jelly-fishes swimming over them in the same waters, agreeing with each other in structure, but differing in specific characters, — sea-urchins and star-fishes, crawling about upon the same corals, and presenting the most minute homology in all their parts, — are facts which cannot be accounted for by the supposition that laws regulating the phenomena of the physical world had of themselves produced such combinations, in which an attentive observer must recognize thoughtfulness, premeditation, special conceptions, combined according to one common, fundamental plan. For all the animals above mentioned have common characters. They are radiated in their structure; but this idea of Radiation is expressed in them in various

ways, and in each class under a particular form. The special modification of the idea of Radiation which characterizes star-fishes and sea-urchins is totally different from that which distinguishes either jelly-fishes or Polypi, and the modification of the former class is still further diversified in its different families. So it is also with the special manifestation of the plan of Radiation characteristic of jelly-fishes. Their different families present peculiar combinations of the type common to all. And the same is true of the Polypi. He must be blind, indeed, who cannot read a consistent thought in these complications, evidently combined with design, in accordance with some intelligent purpose. It is reflection, it is premeditation; and we may fairly say, that each specific existence among animals is a manifestation of a special thought, that each family represents a combination of similar thoughts, and that every great division of the animal kingdom may be considered as a particular train of reflection upon a fundamental idea. Of such fundamental principles we recognize four in the animal kingdom, — that to which we have already alluded, *Radiation*, that which is expressed in the type of *Mollusca*, that which is manifested in the type of *Articulata*, and that which forms the base of the most important among these divisions, and to which we ourselves belong, *Vertebrata*.

The recognition in the animal creation of specific thoughts excludes for ever the idea of a natural development from law, and acknowledges a personal, intelligent God. It may be answered, that the establishment of such laws would in itself indicate as truly an intelligent God. But it seems to us an important distinction, whether the originating thought was of a law, from the natural action of which an animal should afterward be produced without the immediate intervention of the Deity, or whether the being itself was the direct act of the Creator, for the support of which the law was intended. And surely the efforts to understand, so far as it may be permitted to our human condition, the conception in the mind of God previous to the creation, if it be made in all reverence of spirit, is not only natural, but right, and a use which we are bound to make of those powers of mind which we have received from him in whose image we are made.

And may it not be said, that the simultaneous occurrence upon the same spot of animals so diversified in structure, belonging to such different types of the animal kingdom, as those which have been mentioned, and to which we may add bivalve shells, univalves, cuttle-fishes, worms, crabs, fishes, and even whales, present the strongest objection to the assumption, that physical laws may have, in the course of time, called into existence any living being? For how, in one sheet of water, under influences strictly identical, should the same physical laws produce animals so different in structure? And what is true of all these aquatic animals applies with equal force to the inhabitants of the solid portion of the surface of our globe, — applies equally to the vegetable and to the animal kingdom.

The particular location of animals differing more or less in different parts of the world, under influences almost, if not strictly, the same, is another indication that direct thought, and not simply law, is at the foundation of all creation.

We might trace these views with reference to the internal structure of all the natural groups in the animal kingdom, and show that in every system of organs in each type, in every special family, in all the individual species, distinct thoughts are evinced; that these thoughts are consistently connected, and have reference to the general relations in which animals stand to each other and to the surrounding world.

It may be shown that there is a gradation in their structure, and that this gradation constitutes the foundation of all natural classification of organized beings. The relations between structure and form might be further considered, and their mutual dependence be illustrated as so many points excluding the idea that they result from the simple action of law. We might trace the growth of every individual that lives, and be more deeply impressed with the ideal connection existing between them. For here, within the limits of their respective natural groups, the germs of all animals in their gradual development present the same succession, — in other words, the same successive thoughts, — which may be read in the comparison of full-grown animals of all degrees of organiza-

tion.* Such manifold combinations repeated in various directions, which in themselves have no necessary relation, can only be ascribed to an intelligent plan, framed upon due consideration by the Omnipotent Intelligence. We are thus irresistibly led by the study of organized beings to acknowledge the existence of a free, personal *God*.

However satisfactory these results may be in themselves, they do not, however, contain the full expression of the teachings of natural phenomena. Geology shows that creation has not been an act limited to any particular period, that this world has not been made at one time, — that our globe in particular has not been inhabited by those animals and plants only which now exist upon its surface, but that many distinct periods, each characterized by particular forms of organized life, have preceded the creation of those beings which are found with man now upon the earth. Geology shows that these periods have extended through ages, and that the organized beings which have existed during each are all different from those which belong to our day, so that we recognize a series of independent creations, which have followed each other in a definite succession.

The researches into the character of the remains of those extinct forms of animal and vegetable life, upon which such extensive investigations have been made, furthermore show that there is an intimate connection between them all from the beginning to the end; but a connection which is not that of successive generation, one from another, but an intelligent connection in the thoughts of the Creator, similar to that which exists among living animals in the plan of their structure and in their natural affinities. The animals and plants of the different periods are no more produced from one another, than the different types of animals and plants now existing upon earth.

But what is wonderfully surprising and very signifi-

* In the sentences above, allusion is made to the general results bearing upon the questions under examination which have been derived from zoology, comparative anatomy, physiology, paleontology, and embryology, and of which extensive abstracts might have been given to substantiate more fully the conclusions presented here. We have, however, avoided carefully all technicalities borrowed from physical sciences, in order to condense the argument, and would refer for the matter-of-fact evidence to the original sources of information respecting the natural phenomena alluded to above.

cant is the fact, that, in their order of succession in geological times, they agree with the gradation of structure exhibited among living animals, and also with the changes in embryonic growth which animals of the same types undergo at present. Now such facts have an important meaning, in connection with the view expressed above respecting the creation of the animals of the present day. If it is true that they must be considered as expressions of specific thoughts, so truly do the fossils teach us that these thoughts in their present manifestations are but the further development of the same fundamental idea, which has prevailed through all geological periods, from the beginning to the end, in intimate connection. Animal forms of the same types occur in successive modifications through all these periods, and in a progressive series we may trace the fishes, followed by reptiles, birds, and Mammalia to the appearance of man, in such connection and such regular gradation as to indicate that they all belong to the same fundamental plan, and that, whether we view them with reference to their successive appearance upon earth, or in the complications of their structure, or in the phases of their embryonic growth, they represent in every way modifications of the same thoughts. And as surely may we conclude that this plan was framed prior to the beginning of creation, and was matured in all its parts, before the actual production of any special form.

We are thus gradually led to consider the character of God previous to the creation. For step by step, we have gone back to earlier and earlier periods in the general plan of the universe.

Beyond the limits of the existence of organized life we find our globe itself destitute of animals and plants; beyond the period when it had become a fit habitation for organized beings, we may trace it in the progress of other changes, preparatory to what it was to become at the appointed time, — the stage for the display of all this diversity of life. And it is a point not to be lost sight of, that there is such an intimate relation between organic life and the physical world, — a relation of such a character as to leave no doubt that the changes which our globe itself has undergone, from the time of its first formation to the time when life was introduced upon it, had

reference to the creation of animals and plants, and were a part of the general plan of which the creation of higher beings is the crowning development.

The changes in the inorganic world, therefore, which cannot, even in their limited spheres, be ascribed solely to the action of those laws which regulate the material universe, must be considered as subserving, and intended to be subservient, to the development of animals and plants, and therefore organic in their general connection.

How this earth and the other members of our solar system, how the other systems of worlds, how the universe as a whole, is combined, is a subject for the special study of astronomers, and we do not venture to enter farther into this field. But from the study of our own globe we may already learn that there was a time when inorganic beings alone existed; and, from the intimate connection between physical and organic phenomena, we may fairly infer, that this material world was created in view of life, and that the changes it has undergone were brought on gradually and successively, as the changes which we notice in the succession of organized beings, and that these changes have been the results of specific interventions on the part of the Creator, as well as the appearance of the successive forms of animal and vegetable life.

In the preceding remarks we have expressed the view which we would take of organized beings, considering them as manifestations of the thoughts of the Creator. We have also shown how this view may be applied equally well to all finite beings,—to the inorganic as well as to the organic world. And as soon as we are prepared to view organism as the expression of thought, we are also prepared to consider a question of great importance in philosophy,—whether the creation was a necessity for the Creator. As soon as we recognize in nature a harmonious plan pervading all its parts,—as soon as it is understood that this plan has been carried out, in the course of time, successively towards one definite end, developing always the same train of thoughts,—we are justified in concluding, that as it is now it has been from the beginning, at every following period, the result of a free determination of the Creator, unlimited, unrestrained in his works, save by his own decisions. And

we may find in this conclusion an additional argument in favor of the finite existence of matter. For if matter itself, in any condition, had been eternal and coexistent with the Creator, to receive only form, definite form, by his will, its very existence would have been a limitation in the plan of the creation, depending upon the nature of that primitive matter. Matter, therefore, must have been produced in succession of time, and various substances have followed each other in the order of creation; for there is geological evidence, also, that the different material elements of which our globe consists cannot have existed simultaneously from the beginning. We thus recognize God prior to all creation, prior to the existence of matter itself, free to create according to his will, — the First Cause of all former existences, as well as of all present forms of life.

Starting from this idea, we may now consider the Creator framing his plan of the world, devising the means of making it a material reality, and, as physical science teaches us, developing it in a series of epochs through the advancing ages. The consideration of his future works by the Creator, his determination respecting the plan according to which they should be framed, the order in which they should succeed each other, the means by which they should become realities, may be considered as the preliminaries of the creation.

We have, first, from eternity, God by himself and in himself; next, God meditating upon his creation; then, God acting as Creator, upon a plan laid out from the beginning, for a definite end, shown in the connection of the phenomena observed in nature. We recognize, first, the beginning of worlds, kept together by laws regulating their movements, indicating successive changes, preparatory to the objects which shall be in time produced upon them. We see these laws subservient to the future existence of organized beings, causing the different celestial bodies, and our earth in particular, to undergo such gradual modifications as will make them a fit abode for animals and plants. We recognize from the beginning, in these modifications, a determination to render this earth habitable first by aquatic animals and plants. We see the continents lifted up above the oceans, in small groups of low islands, to become the residences of the

first terrestrial plants, of the first air-breathing animals. We see, through successive upheavals, the land increase and assume the form of small continents, growing larger and larger through successive changes, assuming definite relations with each other, and finally establishing the continents as they are now, to become the home of man, with the animals and plants which live with him upon earth.

But we not only recognize this adaptive relation between laws regulating the physical world and the successive introduction of organized beings; we are led to acknowledge also the direct introduction of the creative power, in the appearance of all the successive organized beings which, at different times, have peopled our globe. The supposition that a principle of life, self-creative, might have produced by gradual changes all this diversity of animals and plants, will not account for the facts which we may study.

The circumstance, that there is no evidence whatsoever of the transformation of one species into another, leads to the direct conclusion, that they are, all and every one, the product of direct creative acts, independent of each other, in as far as they constitute each a world in itself, with its own laws, and are related to each other only in as far as they form part of the general plan, the connection of which is recognized in the organic relations that exist between the different types of organized beings. But, at the same time, we must acknowledge that these relations are not causal relations, — that they do not indicate a development one from another, — but reveal only the ideal relations in the mind of the Creator, which, with the intellectual powers we have received from him, we may recognize, as far as our spirit partakes of the Divine intelligence, — only in as far as, being made ourselves in the image of the Creator, we are thus prepared to understand his works, to recognize his will, to bow before his law, and to trace his views and objects in the creation, being ourselves among the numberless creations belonging to that great conception. The creation may thus be compared to a drama, the plan of which was complete in the mind of its author before the first scene was written out; the actors in which were determined in their characters before they appeared on the stage; the end

of which is known to him before any witness has been allowed to contemplate it; the scenes in the midst of which this action is to appear were sketched with reference to the future performance, before any of the actors were called into being; and the whole, with all its parts, in their mutual dependence, had an ideal existence with the author before it became a reality. And, as in the progress of this great drama new developments were brought out, the requisite actors appeared in due time, and in such connection with those preceding as to lead gradually to the final conclusion, in the creation of our globe and its successive stages, down to the present state of things. Though such a comparison is far from giving an adequate idea of the plan of this world, it will at least facilitate our conception of a successive, gradual, progressive creation, planned by the Almighty in the beginning, and maintained in its present state by his providential action.

We now arrive at the investigation of another very delicate subject; and though upon this topic we possess much fewer data than we could command in examining those points which have already attracted our attention, we may ask of science to inquire, next, in what state organized beings have been created. And though, for the present, we cannot expect to offer very full information upon this subject, it will not be out of place to consider what may have been the primitive condition of organized beings. And even should our remarks afford only suggestions for future inquiry, the subject is too interesting in itself, and on many accounts too important, to remain longer undiscussed among scientific men.

If we start from the knowledge which we now possess of the mode of reproduction and development of animals as they exist, we find that they all arise from eggs, and that out of these eggs grow new individuals, by successive and gradual changes. We know, furthermore, that these eggs, in their primitive condition, all resemble each other most remarkably, though out of the egg of one animal no other kind of animal is ever developed, except that from which the egg proceeds; so much so, that we must acknowledge in the egg of each kind specific characters, not distinguishable, indeed, in the material constitution of the egg itself, but none the less

essential to it, as it is not capable of transformation into any other species. The principle of specific life with which each kind is endowed is the immutable character which distinguishes it, though a corresponding distinct organization in the egg escapes our means of investigation at present. Successively the egg itself undergoes material changes, until the germ is formed within it; and this germ passes through further successive metamorphoses, until the new being assumes gradually the peculiarities characteristic of its parent. Some of these eggs undergo their transformation after they have been laid. Others remain in direct connection with the maternal body until they are far advanced in growth; and the amount and the extent of the changes which the new being acquires before it is freed from its envelope vary exceedingly in the different types throughout the animal kingdom. Even the degree of maturity of the egg which is cast prior to the formation of the germ varies in different families of animals.

We are moreover satisfied, that the conditions under which animals undergo their development are no more the same for the different animals, than the degree of development which the egg acquires before it is free from the maternal body. This being the case with the reproduction of all animals, as well as of plants, we are justified in supposing that, when first created, organized beings were not all called into existence in the same condition, but were placed under circumstances best suited for their preservation and growth.

We may next ask, whether it is probable that they were first created in an adult state, or whether it is not more in accordance with the phenomena we observe in their reproduction to suppose that even the first specimens of each species underwent transformation from eggs. We have no doubt, that, as soon as our investigations are made with a special reference to the settlement of this question, we shall arrive at facts which will teach us more respecting it than we know at the present time. And the difference which we observe in the reproduction of animals now existing seems to indicate that the condition in which animals were created has not been the same for all, and that the state of maturity in which they first appeared must have varied in different geologi-

cal periods, and at the beginning of the present creation, with different families of animals.

We may not only assume that these conditions have been different for different families ; it is necessary further to conceive these conditions to have been propitious to the preservation and reproduction of all created beings, to such a degree as to secure their continuance for ages. The present condition of animals and plants upon our globe shows this most conclusively, inasmuch as all animals and plants reproduce their kind in consequence of their natural organization, without any indication of repeated acts of creation since they were called into existence with man. Between creation and reproduction a broad distinction is therefore to be made. Animals and plants continue to live and multiply, in accordance with the law which regulates their existence. All we know of the present creation leads to the conclusion, that all animals and plants that occur at present upon earth were created at about the same time, and have continued without interruption ; and that no new animals have been added to the number since man has existed. We may therefore infer, what indeed is demonstrated by geological evidence, that there have been periods of creation at distant intervals, during successive geological epochs, all the species of animals and plants created at each period having lasted for a given time, to be successively replaced by others ; just as we see that the animals which exist now, and which we are led to consider as simultaneous in their appearance, have continued to the present day.

Those periods of creation, however, must differ from the periods of reproduction, during which animals and plants are simply continued ; inasmuch as living beings then receive the peculiarities of each, are then endowed with the powers of reproduction, and are then established in their mutual relations, which are as various as those now existing. This further sustains the opinion already expressed, that the conditions in which animals and plants were created varied for each kind, as much, at least, as those under which they live at present differ, and must have varied to the additional extent necessary to their first development, independent of a parent's care.

From the circumstances which are necessary to the

preservation of animals at present, we may infer some of the conditions under which they were created. Those species which are by nature gregarious, which live in large communities, in which individuals of different sexes exist in unequal numbers, must have been created primitively with such differences. Those which undergo all their changes in water, and live permanently in it, must have been created there, — the sea animals in the ocean, the fresh-water animals in ponds or rivers. Those which require easy access to dry land, after they have undergone their first metamorphoses in water, must have been created near the shores. Those which inhabit only the main land must have been primitively placed upon it. Those which live as parasites upon other animals, and can only subsist within the cavities of other living beings, must have been created within the bodies of such animals, after they had acquired their normal development. Those which dwell in the fur or between the feathers of Mammalia and birds, must have been placed there from the beginning.

The question here is not whether the Creator could not as well have produced all these animals upon one spot, to spread thence over the globe, — whether he could not as well have created a few, to multiply and spread gradually over the earth's surface, — whether he could not as well have created them full-grown, perfect in all the complication of their structure. Our task is to learn from nature what view of creation is most fully in accordance with the phenomena which we may observe in animals as they exist now. In this respect it cannot fail to be perceived that, with large numbers of the species, even if they had been created few in number, and in the full state of maturity, ready to multiply, their existence, their preservation, would have been subject to so many chances of destruction as hardly to have escaped total annihilation. This is particularly the case with all those animals which serve as food to others, and which at the same time produce normally but few young at a time, and at distant intervals; for instance, most of the ruminants, which are constantly pursued by the large carnivorous animals, and the greater number of birds, especially of the smaller kinds, which fall an easy prey to a variety of larger animals. Even the circumstance,

that most animals bring forth at each birth large numbers of young, seems to indicate that, at the time of their creation, there must also have been many of the same kind called simultaneously into existence. The fact, that there are animals which bring forth thousands of eggs, would naturally lead to the inference that they did not originate in single pairs. And, if we further take into consideration the circumstance, that the different kinds of animals and plants exist in harmonious numerical proportions upon the earth, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion, that the number of representatives of different kinds must have been different from the beginning of the creation. For it does not seem that in nature, in their wild state, animals increase or change in their respective proportions, nor does this seem to be the case, to any extent, with the colored races of men, but that only the Mongolians, and especially the white race in their civilized condition, are capable, through artificial means, of increasing largely and rapidly in number.

There has never been a crowded population of Indians on the continent of America, excepting during the temporary Aztec civilization; and neither in Africa nor New Holland have there been facts observed, leading to the supposition that those races, at any time, have gathered in large, crowded communities.

The mutual dependence of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, and their relation to the state of our atmosphere, are other facts which would rather sustain the opinion, that animals and plants, when created, were called into existence in such harmonious proportions as their action upon each other, and their dependence upon each other, require. And all the facts respecting the geographical distribution of both animals and plants, their special location, in accordance with the peculiar physical features of the surface of our globe, and the preservation of their natural limits of distribution through all ages since man has preserved records of the phenomena which he witnesses, further justify such general inferences, which the few cases of domesticated animals and cultivated plants that have been spread by the agency of man over wider areas than they primitively occupied, will hardly invalidate.

Our next step would require an investigation into the

real degree of maturity and perfection in which animals and plants were created. Here, again, it seems more in accordance with the law under which we see them propagated, to admit that they originated as eggs, endowed with all the germs of that development which is peculiar to each species; that they grew successively to their normal state; and that, sowed in large numbers over districts which they were to occupy, they established from the beginning that harmony which still prevails. We are at least justified in adopting such a conclusion for all those animals which are developed from eggs in water, and may therefore assume, that the protecting influences under which they passed through their metamorphoses agreed with the conditions under which they now propagate, thus acknowledging a mode of creation which is far more in accordance with the laws that now prevail in nature than any other supposition; granting, of course, that for each species the circumstances must have varied then, as they vary now, respecting the character of the egg, as well as the time required for its natural development. Is it not much more in harmony with the laws of nature to admit that the Creator, in the beginning, sowed the seeds of animals and plants in large numbers all over the fields they were to occupy, in the same proportions as we see them now dropped from the stock from which they originate in the normal process of reproduction? Such views agree too well with the present state of our knowledge of animal and vegetable life, and the means by which it is maintained, not to appear natural; and, though we may fail now to extend them to terrestrial animals which are nursed within the maternal body, we must contend that they account fully for that class of animals which are normally developed in water, and for the whole vegetable kingdom. And it may be that, in the course of time, we shall acquire sufficient insight into the development of terrestrial animals to include them in the same category, though at present their eggs are nursed, without exception, by their parents. But may it not be admitted, that, since we have but recently ascertained the identity of the development of all animals from eggs, and we see already the possibility of the larger proportion of them having arisen from eggs, we may also discover the way in which the eggs of higher animals,

even, may be reared, for the first time, without a parent, as it is rather against the uniform processes of nature to admit different modes of creation, though we must recognize the different circumstances under which it took place?

The fact, that the structure of all animals and plants consists of cells, which undergo various modifications in their growth, and which in themselves agree so completely with the structure of the primitive egg, is another circumstance in favor of the view that all animals originated primitively from eggs, and grew up, through successive generations of cells, to assume, under the influence of the law peculiar to each kind, that structure which characterizes them when full-grown. In this connection we should not overlook the indications respecting the origin of living beings which we may derive from tradition, and from the religious and popular doctrines of the oldest nations, who, being from their antiquity so much nearer to the creation than we are ourselves, may have entertained more correct views respecting the first creation than we can at present derive from investigation. Even the mythology of the most ancient nations should be consulted, and may also prove instructive in this respect.

As for the celestial bodies, we know that they were not created in the state in which they now appear. Geology has placed it beyond a question, that our globe, at least, had undergone many important changes in its physical constitution prior to the appearance of organized beings, and that it had an organic growth preparatory to their introduction. The fact, that this earth has passed through phases similar to the present physical character of other planets, shows plainly that it has had a youth, a growth, and an age of maturity; so that its formation may also be considered as furnishing evidence that all created beings began in an embryonic state, and were gradually developed to their mature condition.

L. A.

ART. II. — THE ACADEMIES AND PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS OF MASSACHUSETTS.*

THE friends of education are ready to acknowledge, that very considerable differences of opinion exist between them as to the value of the free-school system, and the extent to which it would be wise to carry it. We do not know, indeed, that many amongst us are opposed to this system altogether; on the contrary, we are inclined to believe that such opposition is confined to those who, from a conviction that theology should be taught in the week-day school, prefer the parochial system, as the only method by which their object can be reached. But leaving these few objectors out of the question, there are those who would send all the children in the Commonwealth to the public school, and provide for them the best elementary education at the public cost; and, on the other hand, there are those who would in various ways contract this provision and expenditure, and look to private enterprise for the supply of the best instruction. We find friends of public schools and friends of private schools, and both classes claim to be equally interested in the end, though divided about the ways and means. A difference of sentiment as to this point was plainly developed in the discussions of the American Institute of Education, during its last annual meeting, especially in the remarks of some of the members of this body from the State of New York, where, whilst we are writing, the question of free schools is going before the people for their decision.

We shall have occasion, in the sequel, to offer a few considerations upon this subject. For the present, we wish only to say, that, in all the earlier stages of the educational enterprise, there is no lack either of room or of tasks for all sorts of laborers, and that there can hardly be occasion for any conflict between the teachers of public and of private schools. These two classes of schools, for the time being, at least, help, and do not hinder, each

* 1. *Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass. Ninth Annual Catalogue.* August, 1850.

2. *Constitution of Williston Seminary at Easthampton, Mass.* 1845.

3. *Catalogue of the Trustees, Instructors, and Students of Lawrence Academy, Groton, Mass.* 1849.

other. The community is not yet sufficiently alive to the importance of education, or well enough instructed as to the best ways and means of securing what is desirable, to provide, at the public cost, schools, which, by completely accomplishing all that is needed in this respect, would make private institutions unnecessary. Even where ample public provision is made, there are many parents who, for various reasons, the soundness of which need not here be discussed, are unwilling to avail themselves of it. All that is done to elevate and improve the common school increases the demand for what is far more elevated, comprehensive, and exact. The child whose mind has been quickened and partially cultivated in a primary school will not be satisfied with his slender repast; he will look for some more advanced institution, where he can be aided to acquire the elements of scientific and classical learning. But in very many towns the expense of a Public High School could not well be sustained, and in many others this expense would exceed the liberality, if not the means, of the inhabitants; so that, after the primary school has done its utmost, the academy or private school of the higher class must be resorted to by the few who can afford the necessary outlay. Only about thirty towns in Massachusetts are so populous as to come within the statute which requires, under certain circumstances, the establishment and support of a Public Grammar School, according to the old meaning of the phrase, that is, a school in which the classics and the mathematics are taught. Besides, where private and public schools are found together, a generous and profitable rivalry may spring up, whilst the benefit secured by a few from private instruction will continually prompt the inquiry, Is there not some way in which this great blessing may be extended to all who are capable of receiving it, — to the gifted children of the poor, as well as to those whom Providence has favored? Out of this inquiry will spring Public High Schools of a superior description, the pride of the people, to be the rivals of our old academies and the like, — to carry on a noble strife for preëminence, in which the better is sure at last to prevail.

This is no mere theory. Where common schools abound, academies and private schools abound. We have

not at hand the educational statistics of our sister States, but we find a great deal which goes to confirm this statement in the Educational Returns for Massachusetts. By reference to the thirty-seventh page of the tables for the year 1849, we find that in the year 1848-49 there was raised by "tax, for the support of schools, including only the wages of teachers, board, and fuel," the sum of \$ 830,577.33, and that, in addition to this amount, board and fuel were contributed for the same object, to the value of \$ 35,281.64, making in the whole the sum of \$ 865,858.97. Now, looking a little farther along, on the same page, we find that there are within the limits of the State sixty-four incorporated academies, and that during the year above named the unincorporated academies, private schools, and schools kept to prolong common schools, numbered one thousand and forty-seven. Moreover, from students in the incorporated academies, tuition-fees were collected during this period to the amount of \$ 61,694.97, and for all other academies and private schools the aggregate receipts during the same time are given as \$ 240,780.79, making in the whole the sum of \$ 302,475.76, paid in the course of twelve months, for private instruction, within the limits of a State whose public schools are at least inferior to none in the Union, whether as to number or quality. We ought to add, that all this is over and above, on the one hand, the interest upon the value of public school buildings, local funds, and surplus revenue appropriated to common schools, and, on the other hand, the corporate property of the academies. Of course there is much private tuition, the statistics and expense of which are wholly unknown to the public.* Further, by a comparison of these tables with those of 1846, we find that, whilst there has been, since that year, an advance of \$ 216,000 in the public appropriation, the amount expended at private schools and academies has also advanced, though not in the

* The above calculations are based upon the *whole number* of pupils for the year, as given in the catalogues of the academies. We learn, however, that the scholars are continually changing, so that not more than half of this *whole number* are connected with a school at any one time. Fifty *per cent.*, then, should be deducted from the amount of tuition-fees. Of course, these short terms of residence are serious obstacles to the improvement of the pupils, and we are glad to know that the number of those who join the schools for a year or more is steadily increasing.

same proportion, the excess being \$ 24,781, an increase of about one third in the former, and of one eleventh in the latter case. The state of education in England abundantly shows that private munificence and individual enterprise require the stimulus of public interest and effort. The conflict between the dominant Episcopal sect and the Dissenters, so called, and the jealousies between different classes, as well as the distrust of education which still prevails amongst the more conservative, prevent as yet the establishment of any common school system, but we do not find that the work of instruction is done in other ways, or that the portion of the enormous wealth of the country which should be devoted to this great cause is expended in the endowment of any considerable number of high schools and academies. Of the four millions of English and Welsh children, two millions attend no school whatever.

We do not care to deny that our sympathies are mainly given to our noble Free School System, the pride of our Commonwealth. This is and is to be our stronghold. The confidence and favor with which it is now regarded are, we believe, sure to increase. But, as we have seen, there is a place still for other means and instruments, and the interest which we feel in the greater protects us from all indifference towards the less. And it is a fact worth dwelling upon, that a very large part of the best education in New England has been given through incorporated and endowed academies. Without some acquaintance with their constitution and operations, and the relations which they sustain to the common school system, we can have no adequate knowledge of the means and methods of instruction that already exist here, and must be unprepared to make a suitable provision for future exigencies. A few pages devoted to this subject may not be without value and interest for those who have the cause of education at heart. We must limit ourselves to the incorporated academies of Massachusetts, but what will be said of these will apply, with very slight modifications, to New England academies in general.

The school tables for the past year, as has already been stated, give the number of these institutions as sixty-four; but of this number only a few are schools

of any importance. In many cases, they amount to little more than good high schools for the towns where they are situated. But the few of a superior order are, it must be remembered, included within the limits of a single State, and some of them can boast of many years of true maturity and fame, and all of them are fresh, vigorous, and increasing in their usefulness. Phillips, Dummer, Leicester, Derby, Hopkins, amongst the elder, Lawrence, South Hadley, Williston, and some other names not so euphonious, amongst the younger, are familiar to us in this connection. These academies are doing a vast deal to raise the standard of education throughout our land. Their influence extends to our remotest west and our farthest south. Many of them are furnished with considerable pecuniary means, and excellent appliances of all sorts for their work, and many an arduous post of instruction is faithfully and laboriously filled.

It is not easy to present any thing like a full account of our incorporated academies. Such an account should embrace a statement of the time and circumstances of their foundation, the amount of their funds, the number of teachers, as well as of pupils, the average attendance of the scholars, the expense of tuition, the objects to which they are specially devoted, the peculiar type of Christianity to which they are consecrated, and the moral and intellectual principles upon which they are conducted. Some of this information can be obtained, in aggregates, from our School Tables, and the particulars of which these aggregates are made up might be learned from the returns that are annually made from the various towns to the Secretary of the Board of Education. We find that for the year 1848-49 the average number of pupils was sixty-two, the average length of the annual term-time nine months and twenty-two days, and the average amount paid for tuition at each academy one thousand dollars. It should be observed, that two academies out of the sixty-four, not having any returns set over against them, are not regarded in these averages. We believe that during the year specified above they were not in operation. The histories of towns and counties, and other historical collections, with the catalogues of the academies, when they

are of sufficient importance to have any, furnish additional items of information. We will endeavour to set down a few facts that have come within our reach.

The academies of our Commonwealth are of every grade of excellence, from inferior grammar schools to the best English and classical high schools. In the majority of cases, as we have already intimated, they do not attract any considerable number of scholars from a distance, but are useful in supplying at a small charge the means of instruction to the older pupils of the town which enjoys the foundation. The fund in some cases is limited to the proceeds from the sale of the Maine land, which it was customary to grant to academies. In other cases, individual liberality has supplied bequests or donations, to a very considerable amount. Phillips and Lawrence Academies have property, each of them, which may be set down at \$ 50,000, whilst the sum of \$ 55,000 has been given by the individual to whose munificence we are indebted for Williston Seminary, and constitutes the fund of that institution. Dummer Academy, in Newbury, is the oldest institution of the kind in the State. It was founded in 1756, but not incorporated until 1782, two years after a charter had been granted to Phillips Academy. We believe that this ancient school has not always kept up with the progress of education, but within a few years measures have been taken, we hope successfully, to revive its life and increase its usefulness. Phillips and Leicester Academies have always occupied very high places; the former for threescore and ten, the latter for threescore and six years, have furnished our colleges with pupils, our schools with teachers, and many departments of business with well-trained young men. The classical instruction given at these schools, and we may add at the Williston Seminary, is of a very high order, — far beyond the best college instruction of the last century, as any one may see, by comparing the account of the course at Cambridge between the years 1794 and 1798, given, in a letter from Judge Story, on the forty-fifth page of the first volume of the Memoir of Dr. Channing, with the course of either of these academies. We name the above institutions only because they happen to be known to us; that there are others deserving the same commendation, we have no doubt.

The Mount Holyoke Female Seminary, at South Hadley, is a somewhat novel and very interesting institution. It proposes to furnish the best female education at a very moderate rate, and, by requiring all the pupils to reside within the establishment, it seeks to unite the school with the family more completely than is possible in ordinary circumstances. Moreover, the building is so constructed, and the arrangements of the family are such, as to render it convenient and desirable for the scholars to perform domestic service, and reduce by so doing the expenses of the institution, whilst they benefit their health and enlarge their experience;—altogether an admirable plan, a truly regenerated boarding-school! Sixteen is the lowest age at which any are admitted, and seventeen or eighteen is preferred. The candidate must have a good elementary knowledge of English and Latin, and will then be enabled to complete the course of academical studies in three years. In the year 1848—49 two hundred and twenty-one pupils were educated at this admirable school, at an expense to each of \$ 60 per annum, exclusive of fuel and oil. The Seminary owes its existence and great prosperity to the efforts of our Orthodox brethren, and is of course under their immediate direction and influence.

A somewhat detailed account of the cost of education at two of our principal academies may be interesting to our readers. We have selected for this purpose the Lawrence Academy, at Groton, and the Williston Seminary, at Easthampton. The former of these, founded in 1793, was known as Groton Academy until 1846—47, when the present name was given to it by our Legislature, as we need hardly add, in acknowledgment of the distinguished liberality of Messrs. William and Amos Lawrence, of Boston. The charge for tuition, *per annum*, in English, Latin, and Greek, is *twelve dollars*, or *three dollars a term*; modern languages, drawing, and music are taught for a moderate additional charge. The price of board, &c., for forty-two weeks of term-time, ranges from eighty-four to one hundred and five dollars for each student. We may add, that two scholars must graduate at this academy, each year, who receive back sevenfold all that they have paid in tuition-fees, inasmuch as there are eight scholarships, four at Bowdoin and four at

Williams College, founded by Mr. Amos Lawrence, which meet the expenses for instruction of as many students, passing from this school to those institutions. The funds of Lawrence Academy amount, as has been already stated, to \$ 50,000. The interest of this sum at six *per cent.*, added to \$ 3,264, the sum received for two hundred and seventy-two pupils at \$ 12 *per annum*, amounts to \$ 6,264, which accordingly represents the cost at which this institution was sustained during the past year, including the rent of buildings, &c. The names of only four teachers are given in the printed catalogue, besides the instructors in drawing and in French and music, but the copy in our hand contains in writing two additional names.

The Williston Seminary is situated in Easthampton, a beautiful town in Hampshire County, with Mount Tom towering above, and the fair meadows of the Connecticut spread out below it. The act of incorporation bears date February, 1841, and the school was opened for the admission of scholars on the 2d of December in the same year. Nothing could be more appropriate than the name which it bears. Hon. Samuel Williston is one of the few men who are willing to give liberally from property which belongs to themselves, rather than to their heirs, and accordingly, unaided, we believe, by a solitary individual, he has founded and endowed an academy second to none in our State,— an academy which, should the large views developed in its constitution ever be carried out, would grow into a collegiate institution, a university for the people, such as President Wayland proposes as the form of school most fitted to meet the wants of our scientific, machine-inventing, railroad-building age. From the catalogue of this academy for the present year, we learn that the charge for classical pupils, and for those who take only English studies during the senior and middle years, is twenty-one dollars *per annum*, and for English studies in the junior year, fifteen dollars *per annum*. The additional cost to each student of board, &c., ranges from eighty to a hundred dollars *per annum*. Modern languages, drawing, &c., are taught at an extra charge. The number of students is given at four hundred and five, and the fees for tuition, without taking into account what is paid for ac-

complishments, amount to \$ 8,037. Add to this \$ 3,300, the annual interest upon the property of the institution, and we have the very considerable sum of \$ 11,337 to represent the cost at which Williston Seminary will be sustained during the current year. We presume that the tuition-fees, &c. at the other academies do not vary very much from the amounts which are here given. They are certainly small outlays for a very large return, though, as we shall have occasion presently to show, there must be many, even in our prosperous community, to whom they are far from trifling. But we must look beyond these outward matters, and spend a few moments with teachers and scholars.

To most persons, an academy seems an humble place, and its scenes would be numbered by many amongst the weariest and the commonest which our life supplies; yet, in truth, it forms a deeply interesting community, and, in its best estate, affords abundant scope for observation and thought. It is at once a large school and a large family. The mere day-school, where the child is under the care of the instructor during only six of the twenty-four hours, well rewards the most attentive study and patient reflection. The best minds are needed to watch over its interests, and its duties demand the best gifts and attainments. Education is a work at once high and difficult, and where it is carried forward successfully, the most curious facts are continually brought to light, and very wonderful laws are continually developed. It is peculiarly a tentative process, a process of experiment and ever fresh discovery, demanding sagacity in the application of the general principles which experience has accumulated. Minds are as unlike as faces and constitutions. The successful physician must be more than well read in his profession, — he must not be entirely unable to discover the precise form of disease in every case, a form, it may be, which has never before been presented, — and the successful teacher must have the discernment to detect the precise variety of human nature which comes under his eye in any given scholar, a variety, it may be, which has never before been noticed; — no easy matter in either case. But, as has been said, an academy is a large family, as well as school, and if it is what it should be, much of the work appropriate to the family must be going

forward within its domain. It is, moreover, a household composed of the most heterogeneous elements, — of a multitude of young persons just passing into manhood and womanhood, — young men and women who have spent their early childhood under the most various influences, happy and unhappy, an unwise restraint or a foolish indulgence, — young men and women full of the most various life, eager, many of them, to learn, impatient, some of them, of control, all greatly in need of home influences.

Our academies bring together, for the most part, an older class of pupils, maturer minds, than are collected in our city schools, — young persons who at the eleventh hour have become painfully aware of the value of an education, or who have been impeded in a career of study, early determined upon, by the want of means, candidates it may be for the university, or for the situation of teacher. Of course, there are many besides, of comparatively tender years; yet we believe that the average age of the pupils at many of our academies would not fall much below the average age of students at Harvard College. In such circumstances, there will be a vast deal of rough and untrained, but strong and keen, intellect in vigorous action; on the part of many we shall perceive the deepest earnestness of purpose, whilst the habits of iron industry brought from their hill-side homes are sustained by a passionate desire for knowledge and a young ambition. It is evident at once, that most of the pupils are there for work, not for amusement. You will not find them living luxuriously, with servants and horses in attendance, as did the boys at the Round Hill School, which flourished for a time on the beautiful eminence in Northampton. Their academies are not, like one of our modern Institutes for Young Ladies, “furnished with convenient and elegant carriages, seating from twenty-five to thirty at a time.” For all this they have neither time nor means, and for all this they have no need. All the arrangements of their schools are upon the strictest scale of economy, and if, as is most likely, poverty awaits the scholar in after life, he is faithfully preparing to encounter it. You will find in miniature, — sometimes, we must add, in caricature, — a literary community, with the usual propor-

tions of real but humble merit, and empty, noisy pretension. The visitation-days or commencements of the academies are not very unlike similar college occasions. Indeed, we well remember a modest literary festival of this sort at Williston Seminary, which was distinguished by a large measure of mature thought, and many a literary orator might be thankful for the wise and pithy sentences which the elder Dr. Beecher addressed to the graduating class. We are happy in the belief that those young men can never forget what the Reverend Doctor said to them, upon the nature and importance of *common sense*. It was cheering to hear him assure them, that no supposed supernatural evidence whatever could be sufficient to satisfy men that one who lacked this quality had received a call to preach.

A company of young persons brought thus together for a common object, and thrown much into each others' society, will soon be animated by a very lively *esprit de corps*, and friendships will be contracted as lasting as they are unselfish. The alumni of our academies are beginning to form themselves into associations, and to collect the catalogues or fragments of catalogues for past years, and they find great satisfaction in keeping alive the memories of the days passed at the old school in united studies and sports. How many must recall the influence for good exerted upon their younger minds by the mature and sober students who are found in the academy! Narrowness and provincialism enough will be noticeable in the intellectual life of such an institution, but children need an horizon, were it only to save them from being bewildered and lost in boundless space. The gods that are worshipped will be, for the most part, deities unknown out of the particular neighbourhood, — a *Jupiter indiges*, with his subordinates, the *genii loci*. Oftener than you wish, you will be told,

"Indigetem Ænean scis ipsa, et scire fateris,
Deberi cœlo, fatisque ad sidera tolli."*

But provincialism, on a larger or smaller scale, is to be found everywhere, and it is frequently a good introduction to what is comprehensive and elevated.

It would not be easy to over-estimate the burden of

* *Æneis*, Lib. XII. 794, 795.

duty and responsibility which must continually press upon the principal of a large academy, or to speak in exaggerated language of the good influences which may be continually put forth by the faithful incumbent of such an office. Only men of peculiar gifts, — only men thorough and enthusiastic in their scholarship, firm, yet gentle and winning, in their temper, and of an earnest religious and moral spirit, — have any call to engage in the work. It is a position resembling the clerical office in some of its most important features, and the two functions of teacher and pastor might well be united in the same person, provided always that the preparation and delivery of sermons should not be required. It is impossible that one should be at the same time a frequent and able preacher, and the principal of a large school; the labor of such a life would be insupportable. Dr. Arnold, the famous master of Rugby, in England, did indeed endeavour to combine these offices; but we believe that his sermons, which, as his biographer informs us, were prepared in much haste and at the eleventh hour, are, in comparison with his other productions, very indifferent performances. Yet the principal of an academy should have much of the pastor's knowledge, and all of his spirit, in order that he may turn to the best account the rare opportunities for usefulness which his station affords. Every day furnishes occasions for the informal and truly seasonable word of advice, for the kind look, the cheerful smile, the encouraging and strengthening example. What position could a gifted man desire before that which was so happily filled by such Christian scholars as Dr. Arnold of Rugby, and Dr. Abbot of Exeter, New Hampshire? — would we might say, of Exeter, Massachusetts. How much intellectual and moral power did those men shape for good! How much elevated and disinterested affection did they call forth! Of how little fear and of how much loyalty were they the objects! How quietly and gracefully did they move about, during long lives of usefulness, the guiding lights and animating spirits of happy, busy communities, sure to be closely associated in so many hearts with the sweet memories of youth, the "*lumen juventæ purpureum*," the days of health, and hope, and courage, and vigorous intellectual growth, — sure to form a part of the bright picture to which the busiest and the most world-

worn look back with longings, a picture which they cannot describe in any save eloquent words! Fortunate indeed are the young persons who, when compelled to leave their homes, their Sunday schools, and their pastors, can be placed under such guidance.

We have alluded to the moral influence to be exerted by the principal of an academy. We cannot so leave the subject. We must insist upon a direct and distinctive religious influence as of prime, essential importance to the institutions which we are discussing, and, we must be allowed to add, to all our institutions of learning where the young are absent from their homes. No young man or young woman can be prepared to dispense with a systematic religious and moral culture, before the age at which the collegian ordinarily receives his degree. It is a point that cannot easily be argued, because it is difficult to discover more than one side to the matter; the whole strength of the opposite practice seems to be included in a vivid dread of sectarianism. What reasons can be given for the neglect of the very heart and throne of our life, when so much labor and skill are bestowed upon a merely intellectual discipline? Are superior attainments and experience, with a willingness to be of service, worth every thing to the young learner in other studies, and worth nothing in the study of religion? Do we not find that children whose religious culture is neglected grow up indifferent to spiritual things? Is not this one explanation of the prevailing worldliness? Must we not attribute the empty halls of divinity, which are so often matters of complaint, in part at least, to the neglect of early religious training? Those who are influenced in this particular by a dread of giving a sectarian bias to young minds, would do well to consider how often they who are thus neglected become, from the very want of knowledge, the victims of an eager sectarianism. The parent, the pastor, and the Sunday-school teacher, in the most liberal spirit consistent with a respect for their convictions, should endeavour to urge upon the minds and hearts of the young the views of Christian truth, in which they have confidence, and when the child is transferred to the academy or the college, he should be distinctly commended to a spiritual guide. The village pastor could hardly fulfil this trust for him with any con-

siderable success, and it must devolve in the academy upon the principal, and in the university upon the university preacher or chaplain, — an officer who can as little be dispensed with as the president himself, and whose peculiar function it should be, in public and private, to gain the ears and hearts of the students.

We should feel bound, in selecting a head master for an academy, not to prescribe formal tests, or directly to inquire into private religious experience, but to secure a well-instructed and earnest Christian man, who would be able and willing to direct the religious studies of his pupils; and, with our views, we should *not* select one who, in justice to his own convictions, would feel bound to teach the peculiarities of the so-called Orthodox sects, — that is, we should select one who, inasmuch as he could not be classed as Orthodox, or have the confidence of Orthodox persons, would of necessity be numbered amongst the people called Unitarians. Many a young man has lost the best religious impressions, simply because he was removed from the religious influences of home and church to an academy or college where the provision for religious culture is limited to a law requiring attendance upon daily and weekly worship. Could the transition be made at once, under pleasant circumstances, young men would often be glad to pass from the Bible-class of the parish to the Bible-class of the academy or college; but allow a year to intervene, and you will be met by reserve instead of frankness, by indifference instead of warmth, and by conceit instead of humility.

So long as the Church is divided into sects, each sect must manage this subject in its own way, according to the best light which it can gain. Every thing in this matter should be open and above-board. When a school is under specific Baptist or Calvinistic influence, let such be the general understanding, and let each sect be content to train only its own youth, leaving proselytism for manhood and womanhood. It is the first impulse of many liberal Christians, when they hear of a large school under sectarian influences, to complain of illiberality, the easy theme of so much empty declamation. They talk as if they were aggrieved. They are not, unless, in a competition to obtain scholars, their children have been lured to the school under false pretences of liberality, and then

they have probably to blame themselves for a neglect to make thorough inquiry. The true course is, not to complain, but to build up and sustain institutions which shall be characterized by a Christianity at once catholic and earnest. Very many persons sincerely believe that a child ought for a time to be kept close to what is known as Orthodoxy, and they believe so for reasons similar to those which lead us to the conviction that a child should for a time be kept close to Christianity; they think it dangerous to place the young within reach of Unitarianism, just as we think it dangerous to place the young within the reach of infidelity. In other words, both they and ourselves, to a certain extent, put faith before knowledge, and with abundant reason. Whether they are narrow and ourselves in the right, or whether we are lax and they in the right, is another question, to be settled upon its own merits; but, so long as we severally think and feel as we do, we cannot act together. ·

In the Constitution of Williston Seminary, the founder has honestly met this point; and although we differ from him entirely in religious sentiment, we can find no fault with his course. He is convinced, as every man ought to be, that an education which does not include any religious culture is worse than useless, — that it nourishes conceit, and increases the power of a selfish being to do evil. He has accordingly made the following provision: — “ To guard against the perversion of the funds to the maintenance of hurtful errors, it is hereby required that Protestants only shall ever be concerned in the Trust or Instruction of Williston Seminary, and that each Trustee and each permanent Teacher shall, on his induction to office, signify his cordial belief of the great and fundamental doctrines, taught in the Scriptures, of the existence of one true God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, of the fall and depravity of man, of the consequent necessity of an atonement that our sins may be forgiven, and an inward spiritual regeneration that our souls may be fitted for a holy heaven; of repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, of justification by the free grace of God, and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, of the everlasting punishment of the finally impenitent, together with those other doctrines and duties of our holy re-

ligion which are held in common by all Orthodox and Evangelical Christians." Every Sunday afternoon, the members of this academy are required to attend a Biblical exercise, conducted, we may fairly conclude, according to the principles which are developed in the above statement, — not very definitely indeed, yet sufficiently so for practical purposes. Now, with the light which Mr. Williston enjoys, — whether it is greater or less than our own, we do not say, — what else can he do, than thus hedge his institution about? He believes that the religious experience which has been developed in his own mind and heart is the only valid type of Christian thought and feeling, and he cannot be content that the religious training of the young should take any other course. Moreover, if he chooses to offer the advantages of his excellent academy to the children of Unitarians, as well as to those of Orthodox parents, the matter being thus fairly understood, they may be very unwise to avail themselves of his offer, but there is surely no occasion for any ill-feeling towards him. If we do not like his school, all that we have to do is to sustain schools of our own, to be earnest in our own way. We have no doubt that in the competition for pupils the sectarian character of an institution is sometimes disguised, and this, and this only, is a fair ground of complaint. Perhaps we have pursued this topic to an unreasonable extent, but we have not said half enough to satisfy our own feeling of its importance. It is as unnecessary as it is sad, that so many young men and women should be separated from all special and direct religious instruction, save what reaches them from the pulpit, — that in so many lives there should be a long and dreary season of spiritual indifference between childhood and maturity.

We have said that, in the present state of education, our academies are all needed, and we have endeavoured to do justice to their work, and to the principles upon which they are, or should be, conducted. They have been and are a blessing to our State, and their founders may well be regarded as benefactors of the whole community. And yet, whilst we would do every thing in our power to increase the usefulness of all existing institutions of this kind, we must still regard them as inferior in principle and in the mode of their operation to the Public High

Schools which have been or may be established in all our large towns. As it seems to us, it should be a great point of educational effort to secure, wherever it would be possible, a school of this kind good enough to do the work of the academy. We must give some of our reasons for this preference.

Education should be carried on as near home as may be. "Home is the best place for children." It is most fortunate when they can return to a home after herding with other children more or less during the day. The bad effect of evil examples is thus continually counteracted, and the hardening process to which the pupils of a large school, especially boys, seem to be subjected, is continually arrested. Our Fourierite brethren are certainly right in saying, that it is a great exposure to be born into such a world as ours at all; and we must add, that, if the child finds evil, so he brings either evil or what becomes evil very soon. As it seems to be necessary, however, that the world should go on, we must try to make the best of it; and perhaps the best thing to be done with children is to send them to school for intellectual discipline and enlargement, and keep them at home and in the Church for moral and religious influence. In a large school, as in the world, the evil somehow comes uppermost, and proves very attractive. It waits for the newcomer in its most softened form; the scholar who entered yesterday has taken his first step in it, and is ready to impart the first lesson in its mysteries to the boy who came to-day. Nothing is better fitted to strengthen our faith in the Sacred Providence, than the recollection of the moral exposures of childhood at school. Who cannot recall many a fiery trial? That we are not all ruined seems to throw doubt upon that "report of ancient writers" that "pitch doth defile." Now it is of course out of the question that the teachers of an academy should keep a parent's eye upon each and all of their pupils. It is physically impossible. They must be left much by themselves, or in each other's society. There must be in every large collection of boys at least a few who will endeavour to mislead their companions, and will succeed to a certain extent. "In a great school, like Eton, no dame or tutor, watch as they may, can be vigilant enough to keep their pupils out of mischief, at all times and pla-

ces. They have no special privilege of ubiquity, and therefore, whilst they were elsewhere engaged, we perverse imps, some six or seven of us, would be sitting in secret conclave over what served us for a card-table, as grave and silent and solicitous as any cabinet council that ever met."* Fortunately, our schools are not like Eton; the age and circumstances of the young people who resort to our academies are favorable to good order and sobriety; yet there must be occasional exceptions, and all must feel the want of home influences. Seven years passed in the studies of the university are surely enough of student life, — enough sometimes to destroy every thing like courtesy and genial household feeling, when it leaves the greater virtues and the essential graces unharmed. On the whole, then, the removal from home which an education at an academy involves is a serious objection to such an education. Let the influence of the principal be never so happy, it ought to be surpassed in adaptation to the particular case by that of the parent and the pastor, to one of whom certainly the child is thoroughly known. We may add in this connection, that there is great advantage in a graduated and systematic instruction of the intellect and the heart, and that this is hardly possible, unless the pupil can be retained under the same guidance considerably beyond the very earliest years, the season of mere childhood. In many towns, the public schools are connected from the highest to the lowest, the pupils passing only after examination from the inferior to the more advanced, and great good has been realized from this arrangement.

Again, it is worth considering, that, if we can secure the necessary amount and quality of instruction by means of Public High Schools, we avoid one of the occasions for the appearance of sectarianism, we do something towards restricting its work and its manifestation to the home and the church, where it may receive its due, whilst we construct our elementary institutions of learning upon the broad platform of the Bible and the moral sentiment, demanding of the teachers to whom they are intrusted rather the exhibition of a religious spirit at all hours than specific instruction in religious

* *Self-Formation.*

knowledge at a given hour. The academy, we have seen, must be sectarian, in some sense. The pupils are absent from parish and home; something more than the pulpit, occupied by one almost a stranger, must stand between them and heathenism, and the principal must be for pastor and parent, and must speak upon religious subjects as he believes. Now no such necessity rests upon the day school, and accordingly sectarian instruction is wisely forbidden by law in all the schools which are supported by general public tax. On the whole, this law is obeyed in its spirit as well as in its letter, though in parts of our Commonwealth where what is called Orthodoxy decidedly prevails, preference is always given in the appointment of teachers to persons of Orthodox opinions, whilst parents who distrust and dislike revival movements are sometimes tempted to withdraw their children from the public schools during the season of the year usually devoted to these very questionable efforts. In the main, however, our public schools are what they should be in this respect, only requiring, like most human institutions, a little patience, from those who are unfortunate or fortunate enough to be in a minority. Happily, we can see a distinction between the Sunday school and the day school, which the National Education Society, the organ of the English Church Establishment, cannot see. In their view of the matter, a day school without catechism, prayer-book, &c., or rather with any thing but catechism, prayer-book, &c., is infidelity, socialism, and Reign of Terror. The children in the schools under the patronage of this society "write passages from Scripture as exercises in penmanship, spell the Scriptures, and, in the opinion of some of the most enlightened supporters of the National Society, they ought to work sums from the Scriptures."* Instead of the encouraging problems about oranges, apples, and marbles which cheered our childhood, — the delightful hypotheses in which John and James were represented as so rich in every thing grateful to the eye and to the taste and as ready to impart as rich, — the duly baptized (and the unbaptized also, if they can be found) children of the Church are exercised thus: — "Of Jacob's four wives, Leah had six sons,

* *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1850. Art. III. *Church and State Education.*

Rachel had two, Bilhah had two, and Zilpah had also two; how many sons had Jacob?" Or, more safely, as not being suggestive of polygamy, thus:—"If Naomi made three loaves out of one measure of barley, how much might she make [have made?—it is certainly a *past* transaction] out of the six measures which Boaz gave to her daughter Ruth." It seems to be the intention of this society, not only that the children of England shall know the Scriptures, but that they shall not know any thing else; and this result is said to be realized in their schools. All such mere secular aphorisms as "Prudence is not meanness," are to give way to such statements of Scripture fact as this,— "Moses was very meek" (*round hand*). Since 1839, the national appropriation for schools in England has been very considerably increased; but the clergy insist that the laity shall have nothing to do with them except to provide means for their support, and, by their opposition to government measures for their management, they greatly impede the efforts of those who are seeking to instruct the neglected two millions. The Lancashire Public School Association propose to the people of England and Wales a system, "the leading qualities of which they recapitulate as follows:—1. Unsectarian and comprehensive; 2. Independent of government; 3. Supported by local rates; 4. Managed by local authorities; 5. Based on the national will";* and this system, though looked upon with increasing favor, is nevertheless still reckoned an ultraism by the majority of the nation. From all this we are delivered. Let us use our liberty.

Yet another reason for preferring the public high school to the academy, as a permanent institution, is to be found in the greatly superior opportunity which the former affords to the children of persons of small means. The charge at the academy seems but a trifle; it is so to most parents, though not to all. But we are to remember that the cost of board, &c., must be met, as well as the tuition-fees, and out of our cities the sum of eighty or one hundred dollars is not a trifle. In many cases, we know that it is obtained by the parent or the pupil with great effort and sacrifice, and the want of it must debar

* *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1850. Art. III. *Church and State Education*.
VOL. L. — 4TH S. VOL. XV. NO. I. 4

many from the advantages of an academic education. Every one who has watched for any time the operation of our town high schools, can instance a large number of children who have gained during their attendance upon them, without money or price, what they never could have purchased, an excellent academy training. A vast deal of intellectual capacity has thus been rescued from waste, and both the individuals and the community at large have been gainers. In the town where we are writing, high schools of this description are sustained for all of both sexes who have made the requisite progress, at an expense to the town of \$10 *per annum* for each scholar; and parents who can give their children their time can have them well prepared for college, for the higher departments of business, or for the occupation of a teacher, free of all cost to themselves except their proportion of the school tax, and the trifle which must be paid for books. We do not include in this estimate the interest upon the value of school-houses. There are very many towns within the limits of our Commonwealth, now without such schools, where a similar provision might be made with ease, and with great profit to the whole community. The first great object of educational effort is indeed universal elementary instruction, — the improvement of the primary, or, as it is sometimes called, the district school, where the training of so many begins, continues, and ends. But our work has not been done when thus much only has been secured; the public high school must now be opened, where the children of the rich and the poor may meet together, that no mind may be obstructed in its natural development, that no available talent may be buried. Apollo may herd cattle for a time, but he was not sent into the world for this, and only a foolish world will long use him in this way.

There are a few objections to the extension of our high-school system, which we must briefly consider before bringing this paper to a close. And we may name, first, the very obvious one of extravagant expense. To this objection it is not a sufficient reply to say, that the money devoted to the public school will be saved in the cost of private tuition, because, in the case of tuition-fees paid to the private instructor, the burden falls upon

those who reap a direct and immediate benefit from it, whilst in the former case it must be borne by those who own taxable property, whether they have children to be educated or not. The provision for the elementary or district school by a general tax is sufficiently justified by the increased security of property and life in communities where such schools are sustained; they are as necessary as roads and bridges, and if our villages are sometimes very bad with them, they would be positively uninhabitable without them. We suppose, however, that this argument could not be used for any thing beyond an elementary training, and, fortunately, we do not need to make any such use of it. The increased expenditure referred to may be justified, even when it is not devoted to the erection of a barrier against the barbarism which ever waits at the door of civilization, as a wise economy, and as a wise charity, — a wise economy, because the practical talent which these high schools develop and train must in the end enlarge the resources of the whole community, — a wise charity, for what better use can we make of the few dollars annually paid as a school-tax, than to bestow it upon the education of human minds? Ought we not to be willing, as public-spirited citizens and as Christians, to make sacrifices for such an object? This is a gift which increases the independence and the capacity of the receiver; at small cost, it sets him free from hard and depressing circumstances, and makes him more truly a man. It almost converts the poverty of a child into a blessing, for it leaves just enough of difficulty to ward off the access of sloth. But may we not go farther than this, and ask, Is a generous school-tax any thing more than just, is it any thing more than a fair compensation due from capital to labor? If the ingenious and the wealthy are making the very elements and metals intelligent, and putting them into the places once occupied by men, can they do any thing less than educate those who are to guide their machines? Even where a generous education is free to all, the interval between rich and poor will be very wide, but without such a provision this interval must grow wider and wider. Can we afford this? In a highly civilized age, the value of uneducated labor tends constantly to decrease. For want of intellectual and moral culture, the

new systems of industry, which are eulogized as the great improvements of our times, have depressed a great multitude to the very lowest depths of degradation and misery, below sometimes the last point at which life can be sustained. Paupers and thieves are multiplied, just in proportion as the wealth of a partially educated community is enlarged. The resources of Great Britain are known to all; but it is not so well known as it should be, that a state which has provided the means of education for only one half of its children was obliged in 1848 to support every eighth person as a pauper. There must be something very wrong in a system which issues in such a result as this. But we need not treat this subject as if any extravagant outlay were demanded; there are many portions of our State, where the people have for a long time cheerfully imposed upon themselves the tax demanded for the support of the best high schools, and neither the handful of meal nor the cruise of oil has failed. On the contrary, there has been thus far a very sufficient surplus for comforts and for luxuries.

Many parents, again, look upon a public school as a place of extreme moral exposure; they dread the influence of the coarse-mannered and neglected upon the morals and manners of those, the circumstances of whose childhood have been happier. They are willing to aid in securing the instruction of all, but, if they would speak out their minds, they regard the public school as an inferior place. They are not inclined to blend children who ought to be pure and refined with those who are pretty sure to be faulty. This objection would hardly be raised, we think, certainly it would hardly deserve notice, were our schools open for our own native population alone. The sons and daughters of our farmers, mechanics, and day-laborers even, are good enough associates for any children. We should be sorry to have any comparisons instituted between the pupils from different walks in life; we are by no means sure that those who have been outwardly most favored would bear off the palm. In our country, it seems to be a dangerous thing to be the son of a wealthy man. The children of the rich are too often the least worthy in the company of pupils; they should study side by side with the sons and daughters of the poor, if only that they may profit by

good examples. We have often observed with delight pupils from every sphere in life brought together into a neat, well-ordered school-room, studying together, playing together, and forming friendships which are sure to be invaluable safeguards against the jealousies of maturer years. The common school is the true leveller. It is worth infinitely more than all the Socialism that was ever dreamed of.

But whilst we see no reason whatever for separating our native population in their attendance upon schools, we can well appreciate the practical difficulties of this subject, in places where hordes of degraded and illiterate foreigners are to be provided with the means of educating their children,—where whole ragged schools seem to have been sent over from the mother country. We have not always been patient, when native pupils have been almost literally crowded out of our schools, and when strangers of a strange faith have undertaken to dictate for us our course as to the connection of religion with education. We have thought that our foreign population might have been content for a little while to use our *free* schools as they found them, and “not look the gift horse in the mouth” before the giver was out of sight. But when we study this evil more closely, we find that it presses chiefly upon the primary school,—that the difficulty steadily diminishes as the training of the scholar advances, and as we ascend towards the highest grade of schools, the attendance upon which will of course be comparatively select. It is to be observed, further, that the children of the most degraded generally need to be sought out, and would most naturally be brought together, for a time, by themselves, to receive peculiar and especial care. They are the forlorn little creatures upon whom the devoted missionaries to neglected children bestow their truly Christian efforts. We shall have more and more, as the attention of the benevolent shall be directed to the prevention of crime, large charity schools, connected in some way with our city missions, and designed to prepare those who are admitted to their privileges for mingling on something like equal terms with the children of the more favored. On the whole, an enlargement of school room and of school means generally, together with the extraordinary provision to which we

have just alluded, will enable us to surmount an evil that must rapidly diminish whenever the tide of immigration ceases to flow in upon us,—if that, indeed, is ever to be. Through the operation of this very school system, the foreigner becomes a native in the second generation, and infinitely worse than any temporary inconvenience would be separate schools or no schools at all for these new-comers. What will be the issue if the flood continues to sweep over us, we will not attempt to say; but we are persuaded that the weight of the present burden need not prevent the successful development of our free-school system.

But, it is said, finally, that schools which cost the parent nothing are not attended; the cheaply gained privilege is undervalued. And here objectors are right as to the fact, but wrong as to the inference to be drawn from it. Non-attendance and irregular attendance are indeed the most serious obstacles against which the friends of education are obliged to contend, as yet, we are sorry to add, with but little success. To many, the evil seems so serious, that they are tempted to call in the aid of the law for its abatement or removal. They would have free schools for all and compel all to attend them. Their arguments for this course do not satisfy us that it is in accordance with the spirit of our institutions and the temper of our people. We are convinced that a law compelling attendance upon school could not be passed, and that, if passed, it would not be enforced. It may do well enough in Prussia, but it would be out of place in New England. But if we cannot join with those who would secure attendance by law, we are quite as far from agreeing with those who would meet the evil complained of with a tuition-fee. It is the merest theorizing in the world to trace this non-attendance and irregular attendance to the fact that our schools are free. If a charge should be made for instruction, the condition of things in this respect would be made far worse than it is; a few might be induced to send their children more constantly, but a far larger number would be led to keep them away from school altogether.

Those who discuss this subject do not distinguish, as they should, between schools which are sustained from the interest of a permanent fund, established once for all

time, and schools which are sustained by a yearly tax. A neglect of this distinction was to be noticed in the discussions of the American Institute, at the meeting to which we have already referred. A permanent fund, so large as to render all further exertion to obtain pecuniary means unnecessary, is as bad for the schools as for the churches of a Commonwealth. Under the operation of such a system, we may indeed look for any amount of indifference. But where the tax which sustains the institutions of learning is voted and paid anew each year, the citizen feels that he is contributing something, though it may be only a little, and his interest is kept alive. Our schools in Massachusetts are absolutely without pecuniary charge only to those who have no taxable property, and those who sustain them are very far from feeling that they are sustained without any effort. In attempting to account for the neglect of school privileges, we must distinguish between absolute non-attendance and irregular attendance. The children who are never in our schools at all must belong, for the most part, to parents who, from extreme degradation, either know nothing about any schools, or are utterly insensible to the importance of education. It is very plain that what they need is the visit of the missionary, not a demand for a tuition-fee. Does any one suppose that the poor, neglected children, who swarm in our cities and lurk in the dark corners of villages, would be sent to school provided only it cost their parents something to send them? Now these children are returned as a part of the population between the ages of five and fifteen, and of course they are reckoned as absentees from school. Again, with regard to irregular attendance, whilst it may be true that it would be lessened if a tuition-fee reminded the parent of the loss which his child must sustain by absence, it is equally true that this same charge would be so burdensome to others, as practically to exclude them from the advantages of instruction; it might benefit careless, thoughtless parents, at the expense of the deserving and struggling. Or, again, some indifferent parent might be aroused by the demand of a fee to make use of the schools, and some miserly parents might be moved by the same demand to dispense with them. In attempting to remedy the evil in one direction, you

increase it in another direction. And yet again, irregular attendance is often inevitable. The children who are sent to our free schools are very often spared from home, and the place of mechanical, agricultural, or commercial labor, only at a great sacrifice on the part of their parents. There is an enormous tax paid in this way, which is not set down in the school returns. There is no need of increasing the burden by the addition of a pecuniary assessment. Even under our admirable school system, there are parents enough who are made very sensible of the value of an education by the efforts which they are called upon to make in order to secure it for their children. It is very easy for those who are surrounded by household domestics and assistants of all sorts to wonder why parents will not send children to schools which cost them nothing. We could tell such persons of many parents for whom there are no such schools, simply because the attendance of their children upon any schools robs them of aid without which their various tasks are almost insupportable. It is with them as if some of us should send our body-servants and nursery-maids and cooks to be instructed during six hours of the day, performing their duties ourselves meanwhile. Should we need to pay a pecuniary fee for their education in order to feel that it cost us something? Would it be strange if we should keep them at home occasionally for a day or more? If it be true, and it is far from being always the case, that the private school is more regularly attended than the public school, it is a sufficient explanation of the difference to say, that the public school, unlike the private school, is made up largely of children whose services at home are often indispensable. The private school costs the parent from fifty to one hundred dollars *per annum*, the public school he often pays for with almost intolerable toil. This irregularity is indeed a great hindrance to teachers and pupils, but patient effort and judicious arrangements will do much to overcome it. Where the circumstances of the scholars favor it, as for example in the Boston Public Latin School, a remarkable regularity of attendance has been secured,—a regularity which does not need to be increased by the charge of a “sixpence,” the sum named by one of the speakers in the discussions of the Institute, or by any other charge

whatsoever. We are persuaded that, as our schools improve, and become for this reason more attractive, and as parents are more and more aroused to a sense of the importance of education, this evil will be everywhere diminished.

We began with the academy, we end with the high school. In the former we feel, and have been able to express, a hearty interest, and we have used words of high commendation, we trust with reason; and yet for the latter our sympathies are deeper and our hopes larger. We are not sure that our academies might not be abandoned as mere schools, and expanded into popular colleges, if a public high school could be established in every town where there is sufficient pecuniary ability. The children of the less populous and feebler towns might be sent to the high schools of the neighbouring region, just as they are now sent to the academies, a tuition-fee being exacted of them in the one case as in the other. We may add, that this practice already prevails to a certain extent. Meanwhile, we trust that, whilst all classes of schools are built up by a generous competition, the public high school will come prominently into notice and favor. We have already schools of this description which are not surpassed by any academies or private schools throughout the Union, whether in scholarship or in discipline. We hope and believe that this will be more and more the case. The schools for the people should be, in all their departments, the best schools which wisdom and goodness can devise, and wealth purchase. Like the churches, they should be one and the same for all. As the wealthy do not go apart from the less favored with their choice clergyman, so their children ought not to go apart with their choice teacher. A thorough school education should be as free as the hard circumstances of many of our fellow-citizens will permit us to make it.

R. E.

ART. III. — POETRY.

A DARK MORNING.

CAN this be morn? I heard the cock
 Cry, long ago, the morning hour;
 And through the darkness, now, the clock
 Speaks plainly from the neighbouring tower.

And yet the mantling autumn-shower,
 So cold and thick, prolongs the night;
 Nor star, nor moon, nor sun hath power
 To show the faintest gleam of light.

Where'er I turn my straining sight,
 I see no living, moving form,
 Save black-wing'd clouds in heavy flight,
 And trees that tremble in the storm.

From Eastern chambers of the deep,
 No day-spring breaks to greet my eyes,
 But sea-born mists, wild-gathering, sweep,
 Confounding earth and seas and skies.

Their endless legions rise and rise, —
 The storm-wind's trumpet-blast obey, —
 The scattered crown of Autumn flies
 Before that murky, grim array.

Where is the world that, yesterday,
 With tranquil beauty tranced my sight,
 As, bosomed in the skies, it lay
 A paradise of love and light?

Where are the skies that met my gaze,
 And seemed to kiss the earth's fair face,
 While over it the summer-haze
 Hung health and beauty, glow and grace?

Wait a few hours; — the sun, once more,
 Who now, behind this cloudy night,
 Still burns and shines undimmed, shall pour
 On earth's drenched fields fresh floods of light.

Then shalt thou know, though clouds and night
 Earth's "little day" may wrap in gloom,
 Above, around thee, heavenly light,
 Unbroken day, and spring-time bloom.

Though clouds of care and fear and woe
 Rise thick and dark from life's wild sea,
 O'er joy's pale form the bier-cloth throw,
 And life's green leaves and fair flowers flee, —

Yet let the clouds of trouble roll, —
 Let them roll on and all pass by, —
 And be not thou cast down, my soul,
 But lift thy trusting eyes on high!

There, in the palace of the sky,
 In light and loveliness and love,
 Serene, in cloudless majesty,
 Thy King and Father dwells above.

Wait a few hours, — and thou shalt know,
 And see "with unclouded eye,"
 Though night and grief dwell here below,
 Sunshine and gladness reign on high.

Then shall these storms of earth, that seem
 To swallow heaven, have passed away,
 Like shadows of a troubled dream,
 When morning mists are lost in day.

THE LAST OF THE "STRUNG PEARLS."

FROM THE GERMAN OF FREDERICK RÜCKERT.

* * * * *

Tree of my life, behold, the searching autumn-wind
 Beneath thy show of leaves a hidden fruit would find!
 Whatever beareth fruit may welcome Autumn's breath, —
 To that which bears but leaves it is the blast of death!
 The swallow quits her nest and seeks a warmer shore;
 O soul, earth's joy is gone! — spread thy white wings and soar!
 My heart would find the Spring, where frowns no winter-storm;
 The rose that in its heart bears neither thorn nor worm.
 I know a garden well where all the springs are found,
 That visit in their flight each zone the wide world round.
 I know a garden well where blossom ne'er was lost;
 Where all bears fruit that here was nipped by early frost.
 A fragment is my song, — and so is all of earth,
 That waits for that beyond to give it perfect birth.
 The love that in the sky the wreath of Pleiads hung
 On an invisible thread these pearls of mine hath strung.

LONGING AFTER THE CONTEMPLATION OF THE INVISIBLE.

A PSALM.

FROM THE GERMAN OF HEINRICH ZCHOKKE.

My soul seeks Thee!

Thee, Father Spirit, Uncreated One,
 Jehovah, Alla, Buddha, Bramah, Thee!
 Round whose eternal throne, in the eternal All,
 The myriads of suns are burning;
 Whose name the rocky globe's millennia, yearning,
 Whisper with awe, Thy nature never learning, —
 I seek for Thee!

I seek for Thee!

Why hidest Thou from me?
 Is it not Thou whose word first bade me be?
 Did I call forth myself, when I was not?
 I am a ray from Thine own light,
 Wondrously shrouded in this earth-stone's ashes.
 Thou art my Father and the Universe's;
 It is Thy child that calls, through mystery's night, —
 Thy child, — why dost Thou veil Thee from my sight?

I sought for Thee!

I soared aloft on prayer's ecstatic pinion;
 The mortal body sank to dust;
 With tears of love its eyes were gently darkened;
 The soul flew, wandering, through the starry tent, —
 In quest of Thee from world to world it went,
 And cried, till all the worlds the cry repeated, —
 "World-Father, show Thyself to me!"
 There came no answer from immensity!
 The suns flew off and back;
 The earths went rolling in their ancient track,
 And, in the brazen law of the Eternities,
 The Universe of being still moved on.
 And then I woke up, shuddering, loving, weeping,
 From my faith's dream.
 The breath of Nature thundering shook the air;
 Yet was Thy voice, my Father, silent there,
 Thy footprints I beheld, but Thee I saw nowhere!

Still sought I Thee,

Whom spirit-tongues are praising all the ages!
 I hearkened for the word of saints and sages,

And Pontiffs, Bonzes, Imans, Lamas,
 All, with one voice, proclaimed Thy majesty. —
 No, Holy One ! Thou soul and source of being !
 They preached themselves alone, — not Thee !
 Not for Thy praise
 The daggers of their faith they sharpen ;
 Not for Thy praise
 Their Golgothas they raise ;
 Not in Thy name
 Doth the High-priest's proud curse from the High altar flame !
 They preached themselves alone, — not Thee !
 In frenzy's waste, while from Thy path they stray,
 No wilder monsters plague this mortal night than they !

I sought for Thee !
 Mysterious One, veiled in Thine own All-presence !
 I glided with Investigation's torch
 Through Nature's secret chambers.
 I saw the boundless, endless stream of life,
 Unfathomable, inexhaustible,
 Surge through the veins of animals and plants ;
 Saw in the water-drop the peopled sea ;
 The blade of grass a town of bustling life ;
 The earth a giant creature of the heavens.
 I saw the crystal melt away in smoke,
 And from invisible gas world-seas outstream ;
 The electric spark dart through the organic whole
 With magical creative power, —
 Here in the steel's magnetic virtue,
 There in the fish's palsying stroke, —
 Flash, like a wing of fire, around the pole,
 And from the summer-cloud its blessings, thundering, roll.
 And solitary, shuddering,
 I stood, at length, on Nature's farthest shore,
 Where, on the mass of dull, dead stuff,
 All things creating and annihilating,
 Life's restless play of billows breaks for evermore.
 Then cried I loud, " O God, my God ! where art Thou ? "
 This dumb, dead nothing, and this living play,
 Swallowing each other now, and now repelling,
 In everlasting strife, —
 Is this the unexhausted, primal source of life ?
 One single lightning-flash of thought,
 Sent from my spirit through this chaos,
 Is something more divine than this blind storm !
 I hover o'er the elemental depths,
 Self-conscious, over what is all unconscious ;

VOL. L. — 4TH S. VOL. XV. NO. I. 5

A light, I glance across the darkneses, —
 A will, I sweep o'er will-less tendencies!
 Who says the primal Source of things works here?
 Where, then, is Love? And Wisdom, where?
 Where is Compassion? Where is Holiness?
 Shall He who planted
 The ear, not hear? Shall He not see,
 Who gave the magic power of sight?
 He, who hath taught all spirits what they know!
 Him, the all-animating one I sought, —
 I found *Him* not, but *Life* alone.
 Him, the all-knowing one, I sought, —
 Only His *wisdom's ways* were shown.
 Him, the all-loving one, I sought,
 And found His *Love* alone!

Still sought I Thee!

My question pierced the heavens,
 Where Sirius and where Orion burn;
 Where round the pole, in everlasting dance,
 Cassiopeia and Boötes turn;
 Where, through the moon-fields of phosphoric light,
 The jagged-edged ring-mountains stretch their chain; —
 It woke no sound!
 I saw the snow-white poles of Jupiter,
 The crescent of the changeful Venus,
 And silently, with golden ring encircled,
 Far from the sun,
 Saturn, majestic, moved, and Uranus.
 I mounted to the sun, — I wandered
 Through his enormous plains of luminous cloud.
 I felt a trembling through the cloud, — it melted;
 A crater yawned beneath my feet, and showed
 The gloomy surface of the fire-swathed ball.
 I saw what mortal eye had never seen, —
 But Thee, my Father, not!
 From star to star, till stars appear no longer, —
 To where a pale and nebulous light,
 Out from immensity's remotest chambers,
 Of suns that none e'er saw, just meets the sight, —
 My prayer still stretched its yearning wing.
 I saw the unfathomable, —
 In the unfathomable Thy law, —
 The worlds obeying, all, in silent awe, —
 The everlasting Father's house I saw, —
 The Father saw I not!
 And, shuddering, from the immeasurable heights, I sank

Back to my dust again,
 And wept aloud :
 Shall He who built this wondrous All, —
 Who in the house of His immensity
 With myriad joys fills every hall, —
 Have need of me ?
 And yet for me this palace He hath wrought !
 Who am I, to deserve his thought ?
 And yet He thinks of me !

I sought for Thee !
 The generations of this earth swept by,
 From the birth-hour of time, before my eye.
 I saw them come, pass on, and pass away ;
 Princes, whom the groaning
 Millions of slaves, with sweat and blood enthroning,
 To short-lived glory raised, —
 Nations, mad warfare waging,
 For gold and pleasure, pomp and might,
 Or for a pious dream's deluding light.
 Delusion's bliss and pain make our world-story.
 The Holiest expired upon the cross.
 Crimes led full oft to laurelled victory.
 Yet folly's coffin still was wisdom's cradle ;
 And as, from cinders and from ashes,
 Transmuting e'en their baseness to itself,
 The spire of golden flame shoots heavenward,
 So, from the ruins of the perishable,
 The spirit of the race divine
 Up to the imperishable soars.
 The foot of man is rooted still
 In slime of ancient night ;
 His head is radiant with God's morning-light.
 In gold and glory, pomp and power,
 Mankind in vain have sought the highest good.
 The last and highest wisdom of the wise
 Is to be undeceived.
 I have been undeceived.

In dust I sought for God,
 And found but dust ;
 And all these thrones, and worlds, and suns
 Are dust.
 Mind only claims for kin the primal mind.

I shall live on,
 When this frail frame is gone.

I shall live on,
 When cracks this earthly ball.
 When the last sun's last glimmer
 Has died long since in endless night,
 Still shall the Godhead's brightness light the All,
 And I am come a ray from God's own light.
 In spirit, not in dust, is manifest
 The glory of the Sire of spirits.
 I am in Him ; in me, through me, He speaks.
 From whom, but from Himself, can I have learned
 To know Him ? Who else named Him to me, so
 That I the great Invisible should know ?
 Who is it that my face hath heavenward turned ?
 Who taught humanity to judge its ways
 By other measure than the power,
 The pleasure of the fleeting hour,
 To settle duty's and desire's strife ?
 Whence comes this holy, this heroic mood,
 That I, for an invisible spirit-good,
 Scorn that in which the world my chief joy bids me find ?
 Dust downward drags to dust ; mind upward draws to mind.

To Thee ! To Thee !
 Thou High and Holy One !
 Thou who within me art self-manifested ;
 Thou breath'st and burn'st in me !

I seek for Thee no longer, —
 Not in the dust for God !
 Thy universe, henceforward, is my home,
 And Thy eternal ages
 My being's stages.
 And they that were — are living,
 And they that are to be — already are.
 There is one God,
 Love, Wisdom, Tender Mercy, is His name ;
 And *one* Eternity all being is,
 And, through all, leads
 The heavenly ladder of perfection
 Upward to bliss !

Weeping, I shout into the Hallelujah
 Of the pure spirit-world my Hallelujah !
 I am, for God is !
 Praise be His and Love !
 I am to be, for God is !
 Praise and Love !

I am to be, for He is,
 Blessed for ever !
 Blessed for ever
 The name of Jehovah !
 Sing Hallelujah !

JESU DULCIS MEMORIA.

FROM ST. BERNARD'S LATIN HYMN.

Jesus, delicious memory,
 True joy of heart thou givest me,
 But sweeter than all sweets shall be
 Thy presence in eternity.

Among all songs no sweeter one,
 More grateful to the ear is none,
 Nothing more dear to think upon,
 Than *Jesus, God's beloved Son.*

No tongue in earth or heaven can tell,
 No speech can ever syllable,
 Faith, only, feels what raptures dwell
 In hearts that love Immanuel.

Jesus, of true heart's bliss the bright
 And living fountain ! mental light !
 All joy transcending in its height,
 Each wish outrunning in its flight,

Thou hope of souls from sin that flee !
 To suppliants all clemency !
 If they who seek so blessed be,
 What shall be his, who findeth thee !

Who taste of thee but hunger more ;
 Who drink are thirstier than before ;
 They know no want, the wide world o'er,
 Save Jesus, whom their hearts adore.

I on my bed will seek for thee
 In close heart's chamber, quietly,
 And in the world's society
 With love still seek thee longingly !

Jesus! where'er my lot is cast,
 In thoughts of thee my life is passed;
 How happy when I find at last!
 How blessèd when I hold thee fast!

When thou our bosoms visitest,
 And with thy truth illuminest,
 This vain, vile world thou banishest,
 And charity inflames the breast.

Stay with us, Sun of Righteousness!
 Lift with thy light our heaviness!
 Dispel the gloomy night's distress,
 And fill the world with blessedness!

Ye sons of Heaven, exultant sing!
 Lift high your gates, loud welcoming
 Him who advances, triumphing!
 Cry, Hail, Lord Jesus, glorious King!

"HE MUST INCREASE, BUT I MUST DECREASE."

NEW YEAR'S DAY, 1780.

FROM THE GERMAN OF JOHN CASPAR LAVATER.

LORD Jesus Christ, increase in me,
 And all things newly fashion!
 My heart be daily nearer thee,
 And farther from transgression!

Lord, in my weakness let thy might
 Grow every day more glorious!
 Thy brightness swallow up my night,—
 Live in my death victorious!

Before the sun-glance of thy light
 Let each delusion flee!
 Lord, bring my nothingness to sight,
 Be all in all to me!

Be near me when, with downcast mind,
 I seek thee, and am still!
 Let thy pure spirit, God-resigned,
 Control my wavering will!

Shine out from me full gloriously,
In wisdom, grace, and gladness !
Thy living image let me be,
In sunshine and in sadness !

Make all within me glad and good,
My walk each day more true ;
The love that Christ's own heart imbued
My inmost soul glow through !

Let pride, let sloth, behind me flee,
And each vain thought begone,
When to thy kingdom, Lord, and thee
I manfully press on, —

My own poor, idle, empty me
Lie every day more lowly,
And let me grow each day, through thee,
More childlike and more holy !

Filled with thee more and more each hour,
And each, from self made clearer !
O thou, who over prayer hast power,
Be of my prayer the hearer !

Let faith in thee and in thy might
Each thought, each wish, inspire !
Be thou my joy, my heart's delight,
My passionate desire !

C. T. B.

ART. IV. — THE USES AND CAPABILITIES OF SUNDAY.

WHAT are the uses of Sunday? To what purposes do the qualities which belong to that day adapt it? What are its capabilities? What shall be done with it? Impulse, example, or unconsciously formed habit, may lead us into one or another course of conduct about any thing, without a conscious purpose of our own, and we may lose or gain, may be led right or wrong, according to circumstances. But reason and principle move us to deliberate and decide with an instructed choice on all

matters that are worthy of our thought or that involve our interests. To those only who have learned this simple but most serious lesson is the question proposed, — What are the capabilities of Sunday? This great question we would now treat entirely as a popular question, keeping it as clear as is possible from all theological or priestly conventionalisms, and viewing it altogether in a practical light. Its religious bearings, of course, are not to be left unnoticed. On the contrary, so far as argument is involved, the aim will be to close our theme by bringing it into the very sanctuary of devotion and piety. The religious bearings of the Sunday question, paramount as we deem them to all other bearings of it, need not that their supremacy should be assumed, or sophistically or tyrannically advocated. We are to be led to the admission of them through the wisest and most candid search after all the uses of Sunday. But while we aim to secure for Sunday, as the result of our inquiries, a religious consecration, we will at once give over all the controversial, legislative, and quarrelsome associations with this theme. Nor is an argument designed mainly for or against its literal sanctions from the Bible. We candidly own to as intense a dislike of priestcraft, or literalism, or dogmatism, as has ever yet been expressed, and we are satisfied that all great truths are independent of quibbles and casuistry.

A few preliminary words, however, are needed to meet the aspect of the Sunday question as it presents itself in our community. The history of the day may be briefly stated. The oldest records of our race — revered throughout Christendom — are introduced with a sketch of the creation of the heavens and the earth, the one chief purpose of which seems to be to declare that, whenever or however the stupendous work was wrought, God was its author, — the one Supreme Being was the intelligent cause. In a record which gives not quite forty sentences to that whole wondrous history, two sentences are devoted to the appointment by God of what is called a Sabbath, or day of rest, alike for himself and his creatures, — for heaven and for earth. It would be very difficult to put upon those ancient lines of poetic inspiration, with all their marvellous depths of meaning, — their brilliancy, and grandeur, and shadowi-

ness of imagery, — the restraints of exact interpretation. Even those who assert the verbal inspiration of the record never interpret it without taking liberties with it. Where a *day* may signify a million of ages, it is hard to say what any other word may signify. But still the spirit, the moral, of the legend leaves upon the mind the impression that the seventh day was consecrated to rest, when human life began on the earth, and that that rest was of a kind which might be ascribed to God as well as to man, — therefore a religious rest, a contemplative, meditative repose, the sanctity of quiet, the introspection of still thought, the employment of the spirit with itself.

The passage of many centuries of time, as connected with human fortunes, is noted in those same records, without a single mention of such a Sabbath on earth. But — and this is a fact alike mysterious and instructive — we find that days are divided by seven, and that seven is a week of years. Why was it so? Who can explain this strange fact, which glimmers out of the deep mists alike of Hebrew, of Egyptian, of Indian and Assyrian history? “At the end of days,” that is, most probably of a week, Cain and Abel made their offerings. Noah, borne up in the ark amid the deluge of waters, recognized these periods of seven days. Joseph mourned for his father seven days. No ordinance or process of nature marks that period. It is not a quarter of the moon’s monthly filling of her orb, it does not correspond to a fourth part of either the *Synodic* or the *Sidereal* month, nor with the course of either of the planets. Yet that number seven marked itself as the first element in these ancient calendars.

In the Jewish Law, amid commandments and statutes covering the whole range of life, the Sabbath again appears with all the emphasis of a Divine enactment, and holy rest, as its use and sanctity, refers it back again to that inexplicable legend of God resting in his work. Of the Jewish Sabbath the history is familiar to us all. We recognize in its rigidness of injunction, and in the penalties for its contempt, the only methods which would temporarily influence a rude people in their way from barbarism to civilization. We find two marked features growing up in its Bible history. First, that voluntary

assemblies met on that day for religious purposes, and second, that superstition and casuistry gathered their deceits about it, and attached sin, not to the wickedness of a deed done upon it, but to the *doing* of the deed, even were it a humane and merciful deed. We find Jesus Christ commending and using the day for its good purposes, and censuring in the plainest terms the poor and grovelling superstitions connected with it.

The same revered records indicate to us how and why a change was made eighteen hundred years ago, by which, while one day in seven was still regarded, that day was the first rather than the last of the week. The sanction for the change to us is found in the example of the disciples of Jesus Christ. Their reasons for the change were two, — the appointment of their Master to renew his communion with them on the first day of the week, and his own resurrection from the dead on that day. On that first day, then, they assembled, quietly, and as if instinctively substituting it for their ancient Sabbath. On that day they met for mutual comfort, exhortation, and prayer; on that day the spirit of their religion kindled in their hearts and flamed upon their tongues; on that day they united in breaking bread; on that day they distributed their charities. These Jews, who had been trained under the old Sabbath, and who had scruples about it, when emancipated from the law which enjoined it, and rejoicing over their liberty, without formal action, and as with one spontaneous consent, substituted for it another day, which they observed with more fervor and joy, not with less. As they drew into their fellowship converts from the Gentile world, these too observed this day, and burdened ages, amid all their changes, their growths and their ruins, their births and their graves, have borne the day down to us upon the unresting waves of time. While the spirit of the antediluvian, the Divine example, and of the elder revelation, is preserved by the consecration of one day in seven, the greatest doctrine of the new revelation is recognized in the substitution of the first day for the seventh. There is still no ordinance in nature to mark it, no surviving monument in brick or stone to perpetuate its history. Whatever command or feeling began it, its warrant to us may be found in its use.

So much, then, for the history of Sunday. A word now for the strife which has raised an issue concerning it. There are upon our statute-book some enactments designed for the sole purpose of securing the day against such uses as would interfere with its consecration by those who wish to consecrate it. The statutes do not enjoin what shall be done upon it; they declare what shall not be done upon it. They do not require its religious observance, but only forbid its desecration. They do not compel our citizens to read, or meditate, or worship on Sunday, but they declare that there shall be no business, trafficking, or public revelry on that day.

Whether it is well or wise for legal enactments to concern themselves with such matters at all, — whether, if they go so far, they should not go farther, — whether it is expedient to have such laws upon the statute-book while they are actually obsolete or unheeded, or are occasionally enforced by irritating and unequal measures, — these are all questions aside from our present purpose, and we leave them.

But these existing statutes, with certain superstitious views and ill uses connected with the day, and some combined efforts to enforce its more rigid observance, have induced a party of reformers to bring the whole question under free discussion, and to demand “the emancipation of Sunday.” Whatever seems to be acrimonious, or severe, or offensive to some, in the measures of that party, is readily explained, as having some reason in it. They allege that Christian ministers have long exercised a too potent influence, a too unqualified and one-sided influence, upon that day; that they obtain from it an excessive professional preponderance; that they turn its great opportunities to some injurious or unprofitable uses; and that, instead of tasking its high services for the great interests of general education, of human progress, liberty, and philanthropy, they avail themselves of it to perpetuate poor sectarian strifes, worthless themes of dry debate, and lifeless formulas, so that the day is wearisome, unprofitable, and oppressive.

Into this point of controversy we do not enter at any length. Beside a natural unwillingness to attempt a professional vindication against such broad censures, the general and indiscriminate character of those charges

would demand extended discussion, if any. There is truth in them. They are not fictitious; nor, when rightly considered, are they unkind, unfriendly, or, still less, irreverent and irreligious. They come often from devout and earnest persons, — from persons who have a most lofty and reverent ideal of the uses of Sunday, of the province of practical religion, and of the province of duty for a Christian, — from persons who, with single and true hearts, would help the triumph of justice and mercy on the earth, and to whom every observance and manifestation and spoken word of religion that does not advance that triumph is but stubble or mockery. Such persons have been chilled, pained, and made righteously indignant by the little good that comes from Sunday, by the waste of good which it witnesses, by the sanctimoniousness and the dreariness of its shows and the emptiness of its results, by the lifelessness of its ministrations, and the heartlessness of its metaphysics and its dogmatics. They have from youth upward found that Sunday did not improve, or enlighten, or help them. They have asked for bread and received a stone. So that there is enough of truth in these charges against some of the associations and uses of Sunday, to require much discussion for their candid treatment. Yet, after all, so many other agencies and influences besides those of real hypocrisy, insincerity, formalism, and heartlessness come in to bear the burden of these censures, that it would be difficult to do full justice in the case. No one class of persons deserves the whole blame here. No one set of influences does the whole mischief. Indiscriminate charges on all such subjects involve, not only injustice to what they attack, but always also a measure of the folly and error which are the objects against which their attacks are aimed. And so those who are known as the most earnest pleaders against the short-comings of ministers, and the poor results of Sunday, might be found chargeable with a full portion of the blame in the case. Set us an example of the right, embody your own ideal of what is good, show us a model of what you would substitute, put old materials into a new and better shape, — these are the friendly greetings which, instead of clamor and hard names, we would address to all reformers, and especially to Sunday reformers. All who do not show

us how to make the best use of any thing must bear some of the blame of its failure or misuse. The reasons which render Sunday and the ends to which it is applied unsatisfactory or objectionable to many persons, are very various; they arise from many causes; the reproach of them belongs to a multitude of people. Superstition, formalism, indifference, must take their full share of blame, and so must the spirit of fault-finding which is rife in the world now. Meanwhile, the friendly method is to seek for the positively good uses of Sunday.

It is important to know whether Sunday has what is called a sanction, or authoritative basis, and what that is, if it exists at all. And here a very serious issue is raised. Is there a specific Divine law requiring the consecration of Sunday, and making it sin to do some things or to leave others undone upon it? Is this the clear and tenable and efficient sanction of Sunday,—or does all the authority which it bears with it centre upon its good uses, its capabilities of good which recommend it to all, and so make it obligatory upon the right-minded? This issue divides wise and good persons, as well as two large parties of average character among men.

Some of the most earnest advocates of Sunday search the Bible for texts in which they can find positive commands, and specific, imperative laws, fortified by promises and threats. They think that such materials furnish the best supports and warrants for Sunday. And these Bible advocates are apt to over-urge and force and misapply a few texts, and not to be always fair or scrupulous. Then we have arguments fortified with accounts of terrible disasters to those who go out in pleasure-boats, or travel unnecessarily, or trade or amuse themselves, on Sunday. These grim and sepulchral stories abound in our "Sabbath Documents." If there is a grain of truth in such narratives, the facts in them and the disasters are to be referred to this,—that a mere spirit of revelry or worldliness is always attended with risks and follies, and that there are not so many persons or means ready to rescue pleasure-seekers from danger on Sunday as there are on other days. But such ghostly stories are most often ridiculed by the very persons to whom they are addressed. They are frequently fictitious, or exaggerated; they sometimes exhibit more of

superstition and simplicity than of intelligent piety, and it is equally unwise and unnecessary to look to them as the chief sanction of Sunday.

For, on the other hand, another large class of persons, seeing the wrong, or the fallacy, or the superstition, involved in this way of sustaining a Sabbath by forced texts and startling stories, question such arguments, and overthrow them by better arguments. The result too often is, the conclusion by many minds, that, if these frail supports are the best sanction for a Sunday, then it has in fact no sanction at all; and so a noble and precious and indispensable institution is left as if unsustained, with few wise friends to plead for it.

It is enough to say of all attempts to enforce the observance of Sunday by positive Divine commands from texts in the Bible, that the less they are relied upon the better. In one view, they will not prove enough; in another view, they will prove too much. The Sabbath enjoined by the Law of Moses is to be distinguished from that Pharisaical kind of Sabbath which Jesus Christ found among the Jews of his time. The Law of Moses required only a day of simple rest from work, — not a word being said about worship or preaching, or abstinence from amusement or food, or from walking more than a mile, or from doing cures for the sick. Pharisaical corruptions made additions to the legal day. So that even if the Sabbath of Moses were proved to be binding upon us, it would not be such a day as the advocates of our Sunday on that sanction wish our Sunday to be. And this method of argument proves too much for us, as it would equally enforce circumcision, and forbid usury, and require the stoning to death of a Sabbath-breaker. In the summary of the commandments of God, which Jesus repeatedly gave, he omitted that of the Sabbath, and that against portraits, pictures, statues, and images.

The most that can be made of the Bible argument is, that it will *recommend* to us the religious distinction of one day in seven, — recommend it on its own merits, its value, its blessings and good uses. And this is in fact the very best argument that we could possibly have for Sunday. We learn from it this great truth, that, in a large view, the fitness of an institution, the great, evi-

dent, substantial benefit of it, is always its best warrant. When argument shifts its ground from superstition to right reason, from ingenious patchworking with texts to an honest-faced, strong-hearted assertion of the truths of practical experience, it makes a change vastly for the better. We look, therefore, to the best uses of Sunday for its best sanction.

Our present purpose, then, is to inquire into the good uses of Sunday, — its capabilities of service or benefit to men, — the necessities to which it may answer, — the advantages which it has to confer. And in the spirit of a worldly, as well as of a religious wisdom, we would make these, its good uses, with the way of securing them, the warrant of authority and the standard of observance for the day. For we may believe that, where worldly wisdom and religious wisdom meet and coincide, we shall find the highest rule of right for any practical appeal to the reasonable, the intelligent, or the teachable.

What good and high ends, what useful and pleasant and improving purposes, may Sunday be made to serve? How much may be gained from it? Of what is it capable?

Some might be tempted to dismiss the question at once, with the brief, general, and indefinite answer, that the uses of which Sunday admits are very various, suited to different persons; that different persons may and will put it to various uses, and must therefore be left perfectly free to do with it as they please, — to form their own private opinions of its sanction and purpose, — to devote it to whatever most interests, or amuses, or improves them; and that, like any other holiday, one of its chief recommendations to them consists in the large liberty which it leaves to all to consult their own inclinations as to the way in which they will spend a day of release from ordinary care. And some do say that they should prefer that there were no Sunday, if they are to be dictated to about it.

So it is frankly urged by persons who thus reply to our question, that it is wrong, if not impossible, to set any standard for Sunday which would encroach on lawful liberty, or conscience, or taste, or temperament; that what would be instructive or pleasant or innocent to

some would be neither to others, and that the less that is done in urging or exhorting upon this subject, the better. The pent-up laborer in the city wishes for the country air. The anxious merchant from the counting-house, the clerk from the bank, the teacher, the lawyer, would enjoy domestic repose and a genial dinner-table; the apprentice or clerk may love to read for amusement or instruction; the farmer may need absolute indolence; social people will crave for visiting; invalids will take the opportunity for a ride, and well people for a walk and excursion; religious people may seek their churches for worship or edification. So say some, in answer, or rather to forestall a more deliberate answer, to the question as to the capabilities of Sunday.

Now, of course, in all matters not included under the sanction of directly inspired revelation, the absolute command of God, nor coming within the unquestioned range of definite legal enactments, men must be left free to follow conscience and inclination. Over this freedom priestcraft has no legitimate power, ghostly exhortations will have but a limited influence, and only the counsels of plain good-sense, and appeals in behalf of a common public benefit, can have any sway. We must respect conscience whenever we would address it. We must allow all lawful liberty whenever we would ask from it a concession, or indicate for it a mode of exercise conformed to the law of love.

Still it is to be considered that these various uses of the day, as suits various tastes, may be conflicting uses, possibly inconsistent uses, interfering with each other, making cross purposes, involving the injury of some in the pleasure of others, and subjecting some to extra labor, that others may find relaxation or improvement on Sunday. Even on any one of our common holidays, whose lawful use for revelry and enjoyment is unquestioned, what is gained to some is lost to others; what is pleasure to some is annoyance or peril to others. The labors of many hard-working persons are doubled on such days, not always with a duplication of their wages. The poor, nervous invalids, and there are many in the streets and lanes of cities where holidays are rife, are agonized by the sound of bells and cannon, of martial music and merry-making crowds, far into midnight. Boys explode

their fire-crackers, to them the very acme of enjoyment, but to the peril of those who ride with horses; and, in general, amusement is found to be almost as hard a task to many as is labor. There might be a strong case made out from the expenses and anxieties and dangers and toils which even a yearly holiday of relaxation and merriment involves for a portion of the community,—a case strong enough, at least, to remind us that there are conflicting tastes and interests at stake when each person acts his pleasure on such a day.

And if these conflicting uses are the accompaniments of a common holiday of annual occurrence, they would, of course, be more numerous, more troublesome, more annoying, in the case of a weekly Sunday, if the only principle recognized were for each one to consult his own taste or pleasure. Every one of those uses of Sunday which have just been referred to as suggested by the general answer, that each person may consult his own inclination, involves annoyance or care or loss for some, in what is relaxation or delight to others. If the city pours out multitudes into the country on Sunday, the quiet of Sunday for those who live in the country is broken. Drivers and ostlers, and engineers and brakemen, must work when they might be glad to rest. Household servants must increase instead of diminishing their toil to provide feasts for the Sunday table. The ways in which some people would amuse themselves with their children on Sunday might be most delightful to parents, and at the same time most injurious to children. If some persons like to visit on Sunday, the other party may not like to be visited. If the pleasure of some consists in motion, the pleasure of those about whom they move may consist in rest. If any considerable number love Sunday for its peace and worship, a very small number may deprive it of that character. Indeed, a person's own single use of the day may put him in conflict with himself alone, as it is no difficult problem to solve how much is gained by the plethora of repletion, and the stupor of sleep, and the dissipation of thought, on Sunday, and how much is lost by them,—gained to the animal sense, and lost to health, comfort, and improvement.

So that, after all, this general answer, that every one

may consult his own taste and inclination as to the manner of spending Sunday, though it may state what is literally true, and what full liberty of conscience or conduct may demand unchallenged, is at best but a kind of selfish, savage liberty, a wild man's plea, and not a dictate of that self-controlling, amiable, and benevolent spirit which makes the common good an element in all individual indulgences and interests.

It is evident, therefore, that, as social, friendly persons, we must qualify this general answer which some persons would give as to the uses of Sunday, and instead of saying without condition, that each one may consult his own taste or inclination, we must endeavour to reconcile uses of Sunday which might conflict, and must harmonize, as far as is possible, some inconsistent or discordant means and ends. So that in seeking to know the good uses of Sunday, we must take broad views, a wide horizon, high estimates, deep measurements. Nor would it be strange if some were to find that they had mistaken as to their own best good, and in looking for pleasure found pain, and lost a possible benefit while hazarding only a waste.

And again. While a friendly spirit and a regard for the common good lead us to set some different standard for the day than that of individual taste or pleasure, we have to consider that only some higher standard than this can retain Sunday as a marked and peculiar day in any shape or form. That Sunday may be even a holiday, it must be something more. That individual tastes and pleasures may find in it their own just and reasonable indulgence, there must be a common sentiment, a harmony of conception or use, an accordance to some extent of opinion, — a measure of sympathy in feeling, to prevent the complete secularization of the day. All of us must agree upon some character to be attached to the day, sufficiently distinctive to mark it in the weekly calendar, to find it recognized year after year, and to perpetuate it. We cannot sustain even an annual holiday without some cause, reason, end, or object, to engage all classes and ages, and to engage them in a common sympathy.

If a number of our countrymen residing in Russia, for instance, were to ask all the inhabitants of that empire

to unite with them in observing our Fourth of July festival, the Russians would reply, "Why should we, seeing that we have no common share with you in what for you has signalized that day?" It would be as unreasonable to ask a community of Jews to observe the Christian Easter, or to call upon the Chinese to keep Christmas before we have converted them. Indeed, that word "Christmas" suggests to us even a more apposite illustration of the need of a very general and a very accordant sympathy to distinguish simply a yearly holiday. For large masses of Christians—for various reasons, founded in history and experience, in religious opinions and convictions, and in private judgment—will not observe Christmas, and the attempt to urge its observance meets with opposition. The reason is, that there is a lack of sympathy with an ecclesiastical festival not recognized in Scripture nor in early Christian ages, but belonging to a system which multiplied such festivals and fasts beyond all reason. The very ground of opposition taken by some Christians against the observance of Christmas is, that all such days detract from Sunday, which suffices for every public religious use, and will be all the more effective for such a use, the more it is distinguished by a sole observance.

Now, if some general and close sympathy of feeling is needed as the ground or reason for the observance of even a yearly holiday, how much more is it needed to perpetuate a weekly holiday? We may depend upon it, that if no consenting harmony of many minds and hearts affixes a prevailing estimate to Sunday, and indicates in general its appropriate uses, its observance in any shape, and then its recognition at all, will soon fade out from society. We must all agree upon its uses, so far at least as to leave it available for any uses. We must respect it enough to retain it. It must have a character in order that it may have an existence.

Once more. We are to look for some specific uses for Sunday,—for uses to which the day is peculiarly and especially adapted,—for uses which are not served by other days,—for uses, too, which help a part of our nature not otherwise cared for or administered to. So that the necessities of men are an index to the uses of Sunday. And what are men's necessities,—those that need more

care or attention? It can hardly be necessary that all the business of life except that which is done in kitchens should be suspended once in a week for the sake of feasting, seeing that most of us eat daily as much as is good for us, and that there is an age at which we learn that a feast is our poorest meal, and is not always a healthful or a comfortable pleasure. It can hardly be necessary that a weekly day should be distinguished for social visiting, for much of the zest of visiting depends upon our moods and tenses of feeling and occasion. Much, very much is to be said, and something will soon be said of the need of a day for resting, for quiet, for peace, in so far and to the utmost length that Sunday will, in this respect, meet a necessity of men, — a necessity not otherwise provided for to any or to all. For our point now is, that the necessities of men furnish an index to the capabilities of Sunday. The necessities of men, taking them in a broad, just view, with fair allowance for the whole of human nature, — its strength and its weakness, its exhaustion and its renewal, its private experiences, its social and domestic ties, its full range of exercise, its exposures and its trials, its earthly aims and duties, its unknown limits and issues, the unsounded mystery of its origin, the shadowy visions of its destiny, — the necessities of men, of their bodies, of their minds, of their spirits, — the common wants of all that live in civilized life, the wants, that is, which are least likely to be met without such a day as Sunday, — it is to these that we are to look to decide the uses of Sunday. And if intrusted solely to that decision, Sunday will not lose any thing. A command once engraved on a table of stone will be transferred to a fleshly table in every heart. A day which has followed the round of human fortunes in the murky ways of superstition, in the briery paths of iniquity, and the blind gropings of folly and error, will come at last to stand, like the orb which gives it its title, for the light and blessing of all our mortal days.

The necessities of men, — they are numerous and very various, some of them more real and pressing than others, and some that are thought the most real are only the most fictitious. Civilization and progress, as they minister so bountifully to some of the elements of human nature, and task so severely some of its energies, do also

expose it to some risks and trials which make us even painfully aware of its most real necessities. These demand all the more the help of wise and good appliances. We feel the necessities of heart, body, and spirit; they ask of themselves for relief, reinforcement, guidance to a supply.

The question has often been debated, whether there are traces of any thing like a day of weekly rest or worship among savages, barbarian hordes, in mountain fastnesses, on desert borders, or in ocean islands. Conclusions vary. But if there were and are no such days among such men and women, there are reasons for their absence. Savage and civilized life, with all their other differences, present these. Civilized life is for the most part regular, with distinctly divided pursuits, exhaustive labors, intenser thought, collisions of interest, social inequalities, and is more vitally dependent upon great institutions of law and love and order. These peculiarities of civilized life indicate our necessities above those of savages, — necessities which Sunday will minister to better than any thing else.

Here, then, is the great day which marks the regions and the compass of civilization. We ask ourselves if a great deal ought not to be expected to come from such a day, if it does not at least admit of a great deal in the way of meeting our necessities. Let us conceive it apart from all its present uses, as if the fresh question were before us, the day being given, How shall it be employed? What shall be done with it? Six days pass round, with all their regular cares and duties, and their many fragments of time for various ease and relaxation and waste. A seventh day comes, not to be so spent, not necessarily, not by custom, as are the other six, — but how otherwise?

The very name of the day, *Sunday*, whether Pagan, Jew, or Christian gave it its title, — the very name, *Sun-day*, brings with it the idea of eminence, the thought of glory and grandeur, and blessing and the skies. The greatest of all heaven's orbs, the brightest of all its shining stars, the source of that power which binds this earth to its annual and its daily pathways, of the light that floods it with radiance, of the heat that spreads over it fertility and beauty, even the *Sun*, — that is the epithet

of Christendom's chiefest day. If Woden and Thor and Saturn, old and unclean divinities, are commemorated by us every week on their ancient days, we use the words in utter unconsciousness, and no harm comes of it. Our Sabbath is named after the Sun, — the Sun that is in heaven, — the pure, unquenched, unexhausted Sun, — the Sun that shines on this earth, whose blaze we cannot gaze upon, — that glorious and beneficent orb, from whose material splendors the old Hebrew prophet borrowed emblems for that other heavenly light, the Sun of Righteousness, who bears light and healing in his beams, shining from east to west, even Christ the Lord, whose is also its other title of the Lord's day.

And there is something that commends this day, and suggests its good use, in the period at which it occurs, once in seven days. It seems to be in a right proportion with the other six days. There is a sort of affinity between this period of alternation from Sunday to the other days, and from the other days to Sunday, — an affinity which makes it accord with nerves and muscles, with thoughts and feelings, with cravings and appetites. Of course very much of this feeling and fancied affinity, if not the whole of it, is the result of habit, because we are used to the recurrence of Sunday once in seven days. The attempts which some over-zealous and imaginative persons have made to prove that there is any thing in our constitution, or the essential arrangement of things, by which one day in seven is exactly the period for the alternate rise and fall of the tide of our strength and devotion, — these attempts may be ingenious, and they have drawn out considerable interesting information, but they cannot be intrusted with any important issue in the matter. But still, seeing that we all need periodical change or relief, and that custom has habituated us to a seventh day, we can easily persuade ourselves that there is something in the radical fitness of things to bring all our feelings and necessities within just that rule of proportion. Six days are enough for one uninterrupted steady track of occupation or effort, for one unrelaxed strain upon man. Six days well employed seem to suffice for livelihood and heavy care, and to deserve a day to follow them for relief, and the seventh day, Sunday, seems to come to multitudes just at the felicitous

moment. Some secret sympathy, or longing, or exhaustion within us intimates, as does the common household clock, that wise companion of our days, that its periodical power is about spent, and that the directing, renewing energy must be applied again. True, we make the clock to need this weekly renewal, and we may lengthen the period of its power. But our choice of that period may be taken as our testimony as to how long the secret springs within us will move the complicated mechanism aright and strongly, without a touch from the Maker's hand. As a matter of feeling, we do not like a clock that goes more than a week without winding. Even an intelligent person all alone on a desert island, if he consulted the healthful training of his whole nature, would endeavour to have some method and alternation in his course of life. If by former habit one day in seven had been marked as a red-letter day for him, even he, all alone, would be likely to retain something of its distinctive character, and would be interested to know how he should spend it.

All the reasons which would influence an individual in this lonely state as to the use of Sunday have their full force for persons who live in society, while other reasons are added for a judicious and improving use of a day in each week rescued from ordinary occupations, and left free to be spent in the wisest way. That a vast deal ought to be expected from Sunday requires no proof to intelligent persons. When we consider the various necessities of human beings to which it may and ought to minister, we cannot but lament its waste and its unprofitable use. Even if the advantages of Sunday are merely lost to any considerable number of persons, one feels as if he were looking upon the conflagration of a noble forest on a winter's day. How many shivering mortals, how many cheerless hearths, might be blessed by what is wasted in that blazing desolation under a wintry sky!

By a train of remarks, which no one can rightly charge on the one hand with irreverence, nor on the other with dictation, or priestcraft, or superstition, we are led to seek for such uses from Sunday as are unselfish first, then sympathetic and harmonious and general, and, finally, such as will minister to the necessities of men in due order,

according as those necessities are most pressingly felt, by single individuals, or by the mass of men. Within these conditions we are to find the capabilities of Sunday. We might view man as an individual, then as a social, then as a religious being, and when we understood his necessities under each condition, we might adapt to them some of the uses of Sunday. But the method will be essentially the same, if, in the simplest manner possible, we consider the capabilities of Sunday to serve us in three specific ways, — for rest or relief, — for general culture, improvement, and happiness, — for religious training in the sentiments and practice of piety and humanity.

Sunday is a day for rest. Rest is a great necessity of men; and Sunday admits of rest. That is the most ancient word connected with the seventh day. It is, indeed, the meaning of the word Sabbath. But what is rest in the sense in which it is used in this connection? It means repose for the physical system, relief from drudgery and labor, relaxation from care, quietude from anxiety, stillness, seclusion, occupation with thought or feeling. These are the general meanings of Sunday rest. Of course, such rest can never be complete anywhere. Some labors of life must still go on, — not only works of necessity and mercy, but some works of convenience and comfort. Sunday is a day of privilege for the sick, the poor, the overtaken, — even for the prisoner. Any edicts or opinions which would restrict the liberty of the day for any such rest, or any such work, or any such privilege, are wrong, superstitious, without warrant from the Bible, and perfectly absurd as professions of homage to God. And the various kinds of rest or relief for which Sunday offers opportunities are to be estimated and indulged in according to the most pressing necessities of different persons, — that is the rule for Sunday rest. There are some whose most pressing necessity is for rest by sleep; and they have a right to use Sunday for sleep, — the whole of it to do nothing but sleep. If any one blames such persons for such a use of one day in seven, let him pause a minute and think. There may be, there is, blame somewhere in this case; but let us be sure that we lay it where it belongs. The wrong is not in a tired man's sleeping, — that is but a conformity to a beautiful

natural law. Nor is the sin in the choice of Sunday for sleep, if that is the only opportunity for it. The blame is chargeable upon the use of the other six days, and upon those unnatural arrangements of society which make life for the whole week, night and day, so exhausting to some persons. Nobody ought to be so hardly tasked through the week as to need, or even to be able, to doze out the whole of one day in seven. In those investigations which were pursued by a committee of the English Parliament concerning the value and use of a Sabbath, much stress is laid upon the importance of the rest of that day to the laboring classes, whose weary limbs and muscles and minds are all but powerless every Saturday night. The result may prove the value of Sunday as a day of complete rest for them, but it proves also that the social system which so exhausts them, that one day in seven is wholly needed for animal repose, is an outrage upon the human constitution. God has designed the night of each and every day for such rest, and only the diseases of civilization interfere with that blessed ordinance. When men and women so exhausted use Sunday for sleep, they turn it to supply their chief necessity. And they are justified. Meanwhile their weary and imbruted forms testify very sternly against a great social wrong. Their sleep outside of the churches proves the general weakness of religious interest in society at large, as much as the sleepers inside of the churches prove their own feeble interest in what nominally calls them together.

But words can hardly be needed to show that Sunday rest does not mean merely sleep, lounging, listlessness, or animal indolence. The need of repose shows itself in other shapes than that of slumber. We need repose from care, from anxiety, from the constant distraction of our thoughts, from the rushing turmoil of business and pleasure in our extremely artificial life. And the sort of rest which some persons need will actually be found in exertion, in occupation, in something very different from what engages their week-day lives. Those who are working for themselves all the week might really find rest in working for others on Sunday, — in laboring in some way for the young or the old, the sick or the poor. This would certainly be repose from selfishness, and it

would promote much efficient humanity on Sunday. There is need enough by all of rest of one or another kind to make the quiet of Sunday a great condition of civilization.

Sunday is suited for various uses of general culture, improvement, and happiness. Its ways and means for these ends change, advance, and multiply with the progress of society. The history of Sunday in Christendom, if written out for the sake of illustrating these uses of it, would be eminently instructive and delightful. The first classical or heathen record which takes note of the observance of our Sunday brings before us a company of men, women, and children, in a secluded place, listening to the reading of the evangelic narrative, and singing hymns, and praying to God. Were not the homes to which they returned happier for those exercises? In the semi-barbarous states of society through which the Christian leaven was working its slow change, we may trace the softening, ameliorating influences of Sunday. Allow that superstition mingled with it, that there was more chaff than wheat, still this was better than to have had it all superstition and all chaff. Through the Middle Ages there were occasions which the Church could influence, though it could not control them, and a period or periods were appointed during which all strife and fighting were made to cease. Those quiet intervals in an agitated and warring society bore the noble title of "The Truce of God." Many had cause to bless them. They have grown to a longer and more general truce. In the mountain regions of Christendom, in some of its fairest valleys, in some of its happiest hamlets, as well as in some of its most crowded cities, Sunday has been a chief element in civilization and all humane works. Little children have been gathered to learn, on Sunday, all that they were ever to know. Neighbours have met for friendly greetings and inquiries. A degree of calm has been diffused over breasts burdened with heated animosities. Around the grassy mounds in village churchyards, where their "rude forefathers slept," or by the lofty monuments of the honored dead, men and women learned much wisdom and love and faith, while as yet there were no books or papers for them to read. The hard rustics who tilled the earth, the shepherds scattered

among the hills, the miner from his dark recesses, the fisherman, the sailor, from their rough ways, the nurse from the sick-chamber, — all lonely and peculiar persons, from their solitary, or mechanical, or selfish, or thoughtless lives, — have been brought together from wide distances, and have looked at each other, and become interested in each other, and a Sunday so spent has never left any one precisely as it found him, nor the other six days to be as they would have been without that Sunday.

Keeping on with the progress of civilization, Sunday multiplies its good uses. Comfortable homes have done much to alter its aspect out of doors. The exercise of private opinions in religion has done even more, and the abundance of books and papers has done the most of all to add to our resources for Sunday. It should be a day for domestic happiness. Let the meal be bountiful as far as is healthful. Let children love the day, and never connect with it one sad or weary feeling. Let there be something in the home, in the heart, in the mind, to cheer the very stormiest or most cloudy Sunday, and to add beauty even to the brightest rays of sunlight, and elasticity to the very purest air of Sunday, when it is pleasant. Let noise be hushed, not because it is wicked, but because it is *noise*, for that is reason enough. Let the largest liberty not only be granted, but claimed for every one, for finding according to his means and taste the opportunities of culture, improvement, and happiness on that day. Let kindness and wisdom, rather than ghostly terror, prevail against mere levity, or folly, or dissipation, on that day or on other days. The day is a good one; it may be made the best one. It is crowned and loaded with opportunities. Its best use gives us the best conceptions which we can form of heaven and its eternal Sabbath. The capabilities of Sunday for general culture, improvement, and happiness are so clearly proved in past experience, are so obvious too, as to need no detail. They are found in quiet, in studying the works and purposes of nature, in the joys and duties of home, in sympathies and kind deeds to the suffering, in reading, and in the collecting together of the thoughts and good feelings.

We have left the religious uses of Sunday for our closing remarks. Religion stands first in most argu-

ments for the day; but whether it begins or closes the treatment of the theme matters not, provided all the other reasons for the day, and all the other uses of it, give emphasis to its religious value. In our opinion, — and that we believe has not been hastily formed or imperfectly tested, as a survey of the best half of Christendom has instructed it, — in our opinion, the uses of Sunday for any good purpose whatever depend upon its receiving from religion a sincere and a very thorough consecration. Religion first distinguished and marked the day; of this there can be no question. Religion has improved the day and made it a blessing for ages and generations. Whatever under the name of religion trifles with the day, or turns it to the service of superstition, hypocrisy, or error, is surely to be deeply deplored, but will be alleged to the discredit of its best design only by the unthinking and the unjust. That the day may exist for the repose of the body, the refreshment of the heart, and the culture of the mind, it must be sanctified by its uses for piety.

Religious training in the sentiments and practice of piety and humanity, — this is a necessity of man. Sunday can minister to that necessity; not Sunday exclusively, but efficiently and bountifully, without stint or measure. In urging the religious uses of Sunday, we must take the largest and the noblest possible views of religion, — its individual, its domestic, its social, and its public offices and work. We know that religion can vie with any other interest in bringing together companies of men, women, and children. Some persons flock to a sanctuary as to a safe and saving place, as sheep are drawn to their folds by night. Others will come to its public services for pleasure or information. The religious use of Sunday is to be found in a sentiment which might reasonably draw all human beings into one great temple, if such a structure could be built. That there is such a necessity impelling man, and such an influence drawing him, is proved by the prevalence of regular occasions of worship all the world over, through all time.

For some of the religious necessities of men, lonely devotion is the proper and ready resource. Others of our spiritual wants depend, as do our social and public

and common interests, upon the sympathies of concourse and communion. Nature as well as custom has led us to associate some of the religious uses of Sunday with an attendance upon public worship. So generally has this fact been recognized throughout Christendom, that we are justified in referring it to a necessity of man. The prompting of a single heart leads it to crave a sanctuary, and the demands of many hearts will turn every true shrine into a place of holy concourse. We need Sunday for its uses of devotion, alone and with our fellow-men. We crave it with a gnawing hunger, which he who does not feel only shows that he has quelled the appetite of a human being with the husks of a prodigal. We need most deeply, we need constantly and periodically, the holy influences of Sunday. It is the great assurance, the best season and means of preparation which the earth affords for heaven. We need it to come with its quiet, early hours, its silent streets, its closed warehouses, its solemn sounds, its venerable Scriptures, its social prayers, its sacred songs, its assemblage of families in the courts of God. We need its repose for thought, resolution, and piety. Do we not need Sunday for all these purposes? Is there any one who has shared the Christian influences of a Christian land and a Christian ancestry, that does not feel that the fountains of sweet and precious good are opened to his heart only on Sunday? The first association which made it dear to Christians was, that it brought two angels to an empty tomb to declare a risen Saviour. How many angels of peace and hope have ministered on that day to empty or troubled hearts!

Whoever with sincere and deep thought reflects upon his weekly experiences and duties will value, as above all price, the sacred opportunities of Sunday. It is the pause which even worldly wisdom makes necessary to the considerate and prudent. Without it, we should turn over page after page of our brief tale of life with a rash and hurried recklessness. Folly might meet with no rebuke, vice never be obliged to contemplate its own ruin in one hour of calm self-examination. As a restraint upon the bad passions of men, a curb upon our besetting infirmities, Sunday does for us more of good than we can readily estimate. Its highest uses are to be

found in its positive influences of humanity and piety. While Sunday has introduced into the literature, the social life, and the public institutions of Christian nations, new beauties in poetry and prose, new fireside affections and joys, and new means of extensive public beneficence to the unfortunate and wretched, it has likewise introduced into millions of hearts new objects of contemplation, new resources in trial, new incitements to an upright and useful life. One hour of that day well spent will influence for good our whole existence. Those who have been confined to their chambers by long and wasting illnesses are often heard to say that there is something peculiarly affecting to them in the deep repose of Sunday, broken only by the sound of the bell and the passage of worshippers going churchward or homeward. The sounds awake in their hearts long-slumbering memories, and link together the chords of severed associations, and call back the whole of life, with its vanished companions and its records of Heaven-appointed wisdom, investing the whole retrospect with a pensive sadness which is cheered with a sweet persuasion at the heart that "God is good." A Sunday feeling in sickness bears with it an influence which we need to have diffused over the years of our health and prosperity.

As to the prevailing arrangements for public worship on Sunday, the assembling in churches once, twice, or thrice, the relations and the tenure of preachers, the mode of service and the materials of instruction, these are all matters on which various experiments have been tested, and the only rule is to retain what of good we have till we can put something really better in its place. There is room for improvement here, as in all human concerns and methods, and the law of its introduction is uniform in all things. Every thing depends upon this, that each person do all that he can to make Sunday a religiously useful day. There are obvious reasons why it is well for families to go in their happy companies to the place of worship, and that a social, friendly, and neighbourly spirit should work in all hearts through the public sanctuaries. Difficult as it is to level the distinctions of life, religion has themes which can deal more gently and effectively with them than can any other agency. The vitality of preaching lies in its intelligible and practical

themes, and in its earnest sincerity and frankness. Humanity and piety may share equally in the subjects of sermons, and the more frequently they trespass each on the other's province, the more devout and regenerating will the sermons be. We certainly have not learned a true lesson concerning God, unless we have learned to be upright and merciful towards men. We have not worshipped God with the spirit, unless we have softened and humanized our hearts.

We find all these uses in Sunday, uses answering to human necessities. We could not add to the force of the argument which they offer for the day. We know of no better sanction for it. Away with all superstitious terrors, — with all appeals to fear to sustain Sunday! Away, too, with all silly assaults upon it, — for all assaults upon it are silly, — whatever there are besides. The day has its sanction in its uses. The gain is theirs who allow it to serve them. The loss is theirs who slight it.

G. E. E.

ART. V.—MEN BEFORE ADAM.*

“MEN before Adam! Men even contemporary with that great progenitor! Men of another line, independent of him, and owning no connection with him whom the whole Christian world from the beginning has agreed to recognize as the ‘federal head’ of our common humanity! What new heresy is this? How unheard of a pretension! Does it threaten any thing less than the overthrow of a whole system of sacred traditions, on which the faith of the world depends? It digs at foundations laid in the Old Testament and built upon in the New. Is it not in direct denial of the very elements of Christian instruction? If Adam were not the first created man, where was the ‘first disobedience’? Where the Fall

* 1. *Men before Adam.* Or a Discourse upon the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth verses of the Fifth Chapter of the Epistle of the Apostle *Paul* to the ROMANS. By which are prov'd, That the first Men were created before ADAM. London, Printed in the Year 1656.

2. *Christian Examiner*, No. CLVIII. pp. 181–204.

3. *Christian Examiner*, No. CLX. pp. 110–145.

that involved our whole race in sin and death? What becomes of the doctrine of a Restorer and Saviour from all that woe? What room is left where any such doctrine can stand? This upstart theory is so subversive of what the friends of religious truth are bound to hold dear, that it must at once be discountenanced and put down, under whatever show of science, and under the protection of whatever celebrated name in natural history it may venture to appear."

We expected to hear many exclamations of this kind, when we opened our pages to the communications of Professor Agassiz in our March and July numbers of the last year. We have not been wholly disappointed. At the same time, we think it creditable to those who would be most likely to take offence at the learned Professor's theory, that so reserved a spirit has been shown on the subject, and so very little has been acrimoniously said. We ascribe this forbearance chiefly to the increased liberality of opinion at the present day, which does not take alarm so easily as in former times, which allows more to the freedom of philosophical inquiry, and is learning to distinguish better between questions of Christian doctrine, and questions either of antiquarian scholarship or physical research. We are inclined also to ascribe not a little of this generous result, at least in intelligent quarters, to a consciousness of the difficulties that press the Biblical account in the first two chapters of Genesis, — difficulties that no one can help feeling the force of, the moment they are presented. The narrative itself makes plain mention of circumstances, which it is not easy to reconcile with the idea that there were no other human beings on the earth at the time when Adam is said to have been formed out of the dust of the ground, and Eve out of Adam. Cain, in flying from his parents, and from the unblest spot that he had polluted with fratricide, has a mark set on him in his wanderings "lest any finding him should kill him"; he marries a woman of another "land"; he builds a city, — which could not be needed for his own use merely, nor raised by his single hands. We are aware, indeed, of the assertion of some, that Cain did not take his wife from the people of Nod, but was married before he fled. The Biblical account does not contradict this; but yet the assertion seems to us

more easily made than maintained. We are reminded, also, that the "city" here spoken of might have been a very diminutive one; "no more than a number of cottages, with some little hedge or ditch about them," as one writer suggests, or "a mere stockade or fortress," as another would prefer to have it. But really this sounds to us like trifling about a Hebrew word. We should construe such primeval documents largely, and bring the telescope rather than the microscope to bear upon them. Josephus says of Cain, that in his new abode he was "injurious to his neighbours; he excited his acquaintances to procure pleasures and spoils by robbery, and became a great leader of men into wicked courses; he introduced a change in that way of simplicity wherein men lived before, and was the author of measures and weights; he changed the world into cunning craftiness." How can this be brought into harmony with the received opinion? And does it not seem to indicate in the first-born of Adam a mythological, representative man?

In addition to the considerations that have just been offered, a careful criticism has discovered that the opening chapters of the Pentateuch do not contain a regular series of incidents related by the same writer, but are composed of different documents pieced together, with more or less of consistency between the parts. This is at least made extremely probable, and conspicuous examples of it are supposed to be found in the descriptions of the creation of man and of Noah's flood. The first chapter of Genesis and the first three verses of the second seem to make one whole; and here we are told that "God created man in his own image; male and female created he them." Then begins a different portion ending with the fourth chapter; and here we read how the Lord, that is Jehovah, formed man (different words being used for the Supreme Being), and planted a garden where he placed him, and afterwards framed a wife for him out of his side;—a statement which is evidently meant to typify the closeness of the conjugal tie, and perhaps also the subordination of the more delicate sex, which was so favorite a notion among the Hebrews, as well as the rest of the Oriental races. The fifth chapter begins a new piece, if it be not rather a continuance of the first one. It recurs to the representation that was

made at the outset, and looks as if it had been interrupted by the history that we find inserted between. It makes Adam a generic term. It says, "Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created." Now Moses, or whoever else was the compiler of these notices of the world's infancy, if he intended to teach that all the tribes of men are the offspring of one ancestor, has certainly recorded as facts things that can hardly be made to agree with such an assumption; and if he did not intend to teach it, the way is open without prejudice to the freest speculation on the subject. In neither case, to say truth, would it be reasonable to cast reproach or suspicion upon an investigator in the department of zoölogy, or ethnology, as if he maintained opinions hostile to Divine truth, because he proceeds independently of ancient sacred traditions, which are found upon examination either to be at variance with one another, or else to leave the subjects treated of precisely where they found them.

We go further than this. We say, that in no case whatever, and in no degree whatever, should the student of physical science be checked or limited in his inquiries by the supposed authority of any ancient writing, however sacred. The provinces of Biblical criticism and of any such science are entirely distinct from one another. It is difficult to suppose that any authentic history could travel down to us from so far; and we do not see why the Old Testament Scripture should be set up as the arbitrator on the method of the origin of the human race as a scientific fact, any more than upon a question of geology or astronomy. We must continue to repeat this, at the risk of being ridiculed for its triteness, as well as censured for its mistaken assumption. We care not how often an important fact is reiterated till it becomes acknowledged, and we deny that there is any mistake about it. The difference between us and those who dissent from us on this subject turns upon a single point, — the plenary inspiration of the record. This inspiration they abide by, and we reject. Hence flow the divergences of our opinion. On their supposition, the book of Genesis must teach with absolute authority whatever it asserts, whether relating to the natural sciences or any thing else; — with an absolute authority, we say, against

which nothing must be allowed to contend. This, indeed, they admit. Some do not scruple to affirm, with respect to the topic now under our consideration, that, rather than depart from the letter of the Divine writing, they would explain any natural appearances that could be clearly shown to be in opposition to it, by resorting to supernatural interference bringing about marked varieties in the human family. And now we will go a little farther in our triteness, and venture upon encountering a broader sneer, by bringing up old Galileo again. We hear it with constantly new wonder, though repeated for the hundredth time, how the true theory of the solar system was rejected as an error and persecuted as a blasphemy, because the book of Joshua quotes from the book of Jasher — which might have been a collection of heroic ballads, or a lyric on the “Conquest of Canaan” — the poetical extravagance of the Hebrew captain stopping the sun, which stopping could not have been done unless the sun moved. This ludicrous example is still a fair warning against pressing our construction of any passage of history from the elder times and the twilight of humanity, so as to bar the way of philosophic inquiry in pursuing its legitimate and peculiar researches. We may observe, in passing, that parallels to that passage from the book of Jasher occur in Grecian poetry. Agamemnon in the *Iliad* prays to Zeus that the sun may not set till he has burnt down the palace of Priam. Callimachus, in his Hymn to Diana, represents the sun as stopping his chariot to prolong his gaze and admiration at a chorus of nymphs surrounding that goddess :

“ Then stopping short, the sun did wondering stand,
Forgot himself, and lengthened out the day.”

Thus much we have thought it proper to say, in regard to the learned Professor and his assailants. Whether he succeeds or not in his endeavour to establish a diversity of origin for the human races, thus including man in his general view of the distribution of animated beings over the earth, he is not only entitled, on all accounts, to an impartial and respectful hearing, but will scarcely be charged with any irreverence towards the sacred writings by those who have just conceptions either of the Scripture testimonies or of intellectual freedom.

With regard to the problem of the origin of man, we

confess that we have always felt inclined, and do still, to rest in the popular persuasion, that it is to be traced back to a single pair. Modern physiologists of the greatest reputation and the most unbiased minds have adhered to that opinion. The profound Blumenbach has given it the support of his strong name. Dr. Prichard and our own Dr. Morton have thought it confirmed by their researches. Even the skeptical and dangerous author of "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation," though he says that, "after all, it may be regarded as still an open question whether mankind is of one or many origins," concludes with the declaration, that "the probability may now be assumed that the human race sprung from one stock." We have seen a copy of a suppressed edition of this work, in which the writer expresses himself with much greater confidence on the same side, relying upon various philological and ethnographical considerations. We have supposed that the speculations of the learned had rather been settling towards that conclusion. Nevertheless, we regard the whole subject as fairly free for sober discussion; and who can say that the brightening aspects of science may not throw some light back even upon so remote and dark a question as this?

We are aware that several objections of a grave character exist in many most intelligent minds against disturbing the general belief on this point, which appears to them a fundamental one. The foremost of these is, that it conflicts with the sacred history as we read it in the first book of Moses. To this we have already attempted something in the way of reply. The objection does not take into view the difficulties that embarrass the interpretation of that history; and it exaggerates the authority which such narratives are entitled to hold over the faith or the inquiries of the human mind. A second obstacle, and a much more serious one, is found in the fact, that the ancient opinion has taken such deep root in Christian theology. To eradicate it would seem to threaten the very life of the Gospel itself. The generality of persons would so regard it, — and apparently with some reason. The little books of elementary religious instruction began with the literal Adam in the ears of our infancy; and the ponderous "bodies of divinity" have chiefly loaded themselves with disquisitions that recognize the literal reality

of the mischief that followed his expulsion from paradise. Far more and worse. They have extended that literal reality, which dealt only with earthly penalties, into a total moral ruin and unutterable consequences. They have deduced from the primal transgression an infinite curse, all that abysmal woe which a superstitious imagination took its time to invent, and has struck the terror of into the heart of the world. Our nature as an inheritance of depravity, and our condition as subject to endless wrath, are doctrines that are made to date from the Fall. The metaphysical scheme of redemption connected with these doctrines is of course dependent on the same alleged fact. Now, to those who believe that these opinions are essential to Christianity, or that they form any part of it, the removal of Adam from his unique headship and his terrible responsibility may well seem a most alarming process. Indeed, we cannot perceive how any thing like the Augustinian tenets could be maintained under such a loss. But to us who reject those tenets as misconceptions of the Gospel, speculations of that kind carry no danger with them for any true faith. We can hear without any uneasiness the question discussed, whether the second and third chapters of Genesis contain an account of what substantially took place in the outset of human history, or whether they are a didactic invention intended to account for the introduction of evil into the world which God had made "very good." We say this with the utmost reverence for what we read in the first chapters of Genesis. We do not honor it less than others, by honoring it in another way. We are filled with veneration when we repeat the opening sentence: — "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." We feel underneath us the unshaken foundation of its truth. We are lifted up by its matchless sublimity. It is a worthy overture to the Book of books. And as we read on in the simple and beautiful narrative, we cannot fail to be struck with its divine contrast to all the gloomy and grotesque, the wild or childish cosmogonies, that have been handed down from every other source. But let us interpret it in the light and height of its own free spirit, and not with the peering eye of a superstitious scrutiny, and not by the smoky lamp of a scholastic dogmatism. Let us bring to its great meaning

the same mind that we should apply to any other testimony that had come from the depths of antiquity to present its claim upon our respect.

It may be objected further, that not only this portion of the Jewish Scriptures, but the New Testament also, recognizes the personal individuality of Adam as the first created man. The chief Apostle, in his Epistle to the Romans, speaks of sin entering into the world, and death by sin, through one man's offence. And whose heart has not thrilled at the triumphal strain of the famous fifteenth of Corinthians:— "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive"? How shall we presume to charge St. Paul with misapprehension? Or how can we bear to strike out from the Christian testimony passages of such noble import? Nay, how can we consistently do it, and retain our reverence for Holy Writ? To this an answer may easily be made, showing that the difficulty is much less than it appears, and disembarassing a subject of purely philosophical investigation from the suspicion of being hostile to any sacred authority.

One might at first be ready to suppose that the Adam of Genesis is continually referred to in the Bible, and figures upon its pages in scarcely less prominent a manner than in the discourses of theologians. The very reverse of this is strikingly the case. The Old Testament nowhere names him after the first instance; for the passages Deut. xxxii. 8 and Job xxxi. 33 are incorrectly rendered in our common translation. No word of the Saviour makes any reference to him. He is mentioned nowhere in the Gospels, except in the genealogical register of Luke; nowhere in the Acts. In the Epistles we begin to hear of him, but even there with an infrequency that to many will seem surprising,— not more times than the number of fingers upon one of our hands. The Apostle of the Gentiles speaks of him but in one place besides the two just cited. It is in his First Epistle to Timothy, where, in teaching that women should "learn in silence with all subjection," he says, "For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression." Jude closes this small list, quoting what he calls a proph-

ecy of "Enoch, the seventh from Adam," but without any doctrinal intent. We have only to put a liberal construction, then, upon the language of St. Paul, in order to obviate all unfriendly inferences from that quarter. And how are we to interpret him? In conformity, as we think, with the rest of his Biblical references. Every one who is familiar with his methods of representation is struck with nothing in them more than with his fondness for allegorizing the events of sacred story. He rarely alludes to them except for some exercise, in this kind, of his fervid imagination. He is eager to press all the incidents connected with his ancestral faith into the service of the new religion. He loves to illustrate by names that were familiar and hallowed to his childhood the truths of which he was sent to bear witness to all time. The ancient legends swept before him, and he was fond of turning them into types and images of the great days that were to come. Every thing in Moses was to him a foreshadowing of Christ. The expressions of historians and psalmists and prophets are taken out from their original and obvious meanings, and applied to his own immediate purpose. Figures and similitudes are his delight, and these all suggested from the same Hebrew repository. Thus, the rock in the wilderness, from which Moses brought drink for his people, was Messiah himself; and Abraham's poor, ill-used Hagar was "Mount Sinai in Arabia, answering to Jerusalem which now is, in bondage with her children." Anxious that the new dispensation should be shown to have in all things the pre-eminence over the former one, he is perpetually bringing them into resemblance and contrast, wholly regardless whether these relations between them are any thing more than ideal, such as the imagination alone could discover. Now, what forbids that we should interpret according to these observations the two passages that we first adduced? Why may we not suppose these things, too, to be spoken figuratively? Can we well do otherwise than suppose it? And wherein do we detract from their force by such a construction? The same spiritual truth lies in the heart of them, whatever view may be taken of the Mosaic document, and is not affected by any critical speculations about it in the least degree. In the former instance, it is equally a fact, that the "free gift" of the

Gospel, declaring forgiveness and heavenly mercy, displayed an abounding over-weight of grace against all penalties denounced or imagined,—against all the dependencies of the heart and the miseries of the world. In the latter, it is equally a fact, that life and immortality have been brought to light by the mission of a Saviour, whilst we all bring with us at our birth the terms of mortality, and—whether a forefather fell from his first estate or not—the subjection to death. This truth, we maintain, abides unshaken, the same. What tradition from the ages before the flood can make it any greater? What hypothesis in the natural history of the present hour can make it any less? The burial-service over our dead will not part with a note or a tone of its solemn but jubilant music, whether the Divine Power that placed man upon the earth to strive and perish covered his helplessness and guided his inexperience in one region of the globe or in several regions,—in one pair or in more. There are realities for the human soul, that cannot be drawn out into literal statements or logical formulas. We are of opinion that the Scriptures will bear to be construed much more generously than they have hitherto been, and that they will have to be so construed to meet the demands of the mind, and that they will suffer nothing, but gain the more, by such an advancement. Many things in them are yet to be transplanted from the theology of doctrine to the theology of sentiment and feeling, and remain materials for faith still. Many may come to be removed from the inner to the outer courts, from the sanctuary of instruction to the open fields of learned curiosity, and deserve and maintain a revered place nevertheless. We have no fear that science will ever be detrimental to religion. We should rather fear lest the popular religion should be narrow-eyed towards a larger Biblical criticism and scientific men.

Another alarm has been taken, of a very different kind from the apprehensions already mentioned, at the very conjecture that the human race might have had different centres of origin. It does not spring so much from a theological as from a philanthropic source. It apprehends a perilous interference with the doctrine of the brotherhood of mankind. How can they be of the same lineage, if they have not a common progenitor? Some

persons seem to think, that one of the principal appeals to mutual consideration would be gone, if we had to acknowledge in our descent a plurality of stocks. The idea of a single earthly father seems hardly less essential for their sympathies, than the idea of one Father in heaven does for their devotions. We confess that we cannot regard the matter in this light. The unity of the race is just as well established on one theory as on another. It does not depend in the least degree upon any speculations relating to Adam. It is a plain physiological fact. We are a species by itself; constituted such by our make and faculties; defined to be such according to the same principles that divide all other living creatures into their respective classes. We are no less men, on the supposition of several original heads, than on that of two such individuals only. And it is as men that we owe good-will to one another. Our social duties are prescribed to us by our moral sentiments, our mutual relations, and the commandments of God. We do not see that they need know any thing or care any thing about pedigrees, or primordials, or any written tradition whatever. Our nature and our state, under the precepts of our divine religion, are to decide every thing for us in this respect. God "hath made of one blood," said Paul in his noble speech before the Athenian Areopagus, "all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth; and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." Whatever the chronology may be, and from whatever beginnings those bounds may have been filled, here is the one blood, i. e. one species, scattered into their wide-apart dwelling-places. One might rest satisfied with this description. Since we have brought forward this sentence from Paul, it is not irrelevant to say, that the strictest construction of his Greek words would rather favor than otherwise the notion of man's having been placed from the first on different spots of the surface of the globe. For the verb "to dwell" is not in the *future* infinitive but the *present* infinitive; implying, not that they were "*for to dwell*" there, but that they actually did so dwell from the time they were "made." The words "before appointed," also, according to the most approved reading of the original text, should be "thereunto appointed." We lay no

stress, however, on this, or on any minute point of such a kind; in the first place, because we can never attach much importance to what may be called the smaller criticism, but still more because we do not think that the disciple of Gamaliel would have been likely to depart here from the traditional faith of his countrymen. Our object is answered, if the passage is allowed not to preclude or prejudice inquiry on the general subject.

We commenced this article with some exclamations, put into the mouths of imaginary persons. Among these exclamations was one of wonder at the audacious novelty of the supposition, that Adam may not have been the only human being who proceeded immediately from the creative power of God. The supposition is not so new as is commonly imagined. About two hundred years ago, Isaac la Peyrère, a Protestant writer of Bordeaux, published anonymously a book in Holland called *Præadamitæ*. It was translated into our own tongue and printed in London the same year and the year following, 1655 and 1656. Its English title we have placed at the head of our article. A copy of this "singular and very scarce book" was presented by Thomas Hollis to the College Library at Cambridge. The treatise, which consists of two distinct pieces, the longer of them but short, was abundantly replied to by the divines of that day. Among others, Ursinus launched at the author from Frankfort a refutation that bore the fierce but witty title, "Novus Prometheus, Præadamitarum plastes, ad Caucasum relegatus et religatus," which we would translate for our readers if the jingle that it contains could be heard well in another language. Poor Peyrère found that this threat was likely to be visited upon him with something more than a figurative fulfilment. The Popish doctors were preparing to take in hand the author as well as his performance, and to send him *bound and bound for* — not, indeed, "the frosty Caucasus," but a much warmer place — a pile of blazing fagots. He therefore thought it best to repair to Rome and abjure all his heresies together. He did not take this step, however, till he had been seized by armed men, who broke into his apartment at Brussels and hurried him off to a prison in the Spanish Netherlands. Ménage, his fellow-countryman, says of him: — "The good man boarded at Notre Dame des Ver-

tus with the Fathers of the Oratoire. He was always bewitched with his Præadamites, and appears to have died in that conceit. He would have been very glad to have known that there is a certain rabbi who speaks of Adam's tutor. But the rabbi was nothing but a rabbi, and that is enough said. When his book came out, it was condemned to be burnt by the hangman. I begged him, as he was one of my friends, to send me a copy of it before it came into the light. He understood my joke, and sent me one, with this verse from Ovid, — substituting the word *ignem* for *urbem* : —

'Parve, nec invideo, sine me, liber, ibis in ignem.'

'Little book, I envy you not; without me you will go to the flame-pile.'

M. Ménage did not consider that his friend might possibly have referred to this very "rabbi" when he said, — "It is not known that Adam, who was the criminal, and (as they say) the first fountain of so great evils, was ever so much as troubled with the least disease all the Nine hundred and thirty years which he liv'd, unless you will believe him, who relates out of I do not know what Author, that Adam dyed of the Gout, with which he was troubled, and which he pretends that he had by succession from his Ancestors."

We are sorry that he should have charged the excellent Grotius with treating him unhandsomely, in having borrowed his unrevised manuscript under color of friendship, and then abused him by speaking of him in his discourse on the American Nations as of "one in France, who lately dream'd that there were some men before Adam; in which belief," he adds, "I see a great danger imminent to religion." "The danger that he saw," he rather crustily replies, "was, that he perceived the original sin of Adam was by this doctrine quite overthrown." Certainly the illustrious Hollander was not called upon to be of his opinion because he had obtained an early sight of his dissertation. As to the reproach of being a "dreamer," he found no softer name from Dr. Ammon, in a note in the Koppian New Testament, IV. 109, — "*quemadmodum Peyrerius somniavit.*" The German professor is not indeed speaking of his general theory, but of his interpretation of the word "law," in Romans v. 13. But it was just that little word which seems to

have led La Peyrère to the resolution of publishing his whole theory.

We have mentioned the division of this work into two parts. The title-page of one of them we have taken occasion to quote already. That of the other is, "A Theological Systeme upon that Presupposition, that Men were before Adam. The First Part. London, printed in the Year 1655." We feel inclined, on account of the singularity of the theme, to dwell upon it a little longer, that our readers may have some idea of the main current of thought in the treatment of it. They who read with close attention the three verses in the Epistle to the Romans on which La Peyrère founds his hypothesis, while they perceive, perhaps, plainly enough the leading purpose of the Apostle, will be apt to find themselves tied up in a logical knot when they come to particulars, that may perplex their thoughts not a little. It has been picked upon by a great multitude of dissentient commentators, from the earliest times to the most recent, each one tolerably certain that he had untied it. But while it loosens in one part it grows complicated in another. We think we have seized it at the right tangle, when straight-way something baffles our touch. A too impatient endeavour to solve the problem would almost tempt one to fear lest the rapid Apostle had raised one more question than he had perfectly answered. We have no intention to puzzle our readers with what at every fresh application to it has puzzled ourselves, but only to show them the point from which our author takes his departure. It is a philological point. He does not seem to have been started on his search by the discrepancies in the Mosaic accounts. He certainly was not instigated by any spirit of natural science. But he was bent on thinking that the words, "till the time of the law sin was in the world," meant that before the time of the law of obedience which Adam broke there was sin, and therefore there must have been men living to commit it; and they who "had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" were those very men. But the sin was not imputed before that law was announced and broken. Death was previously only a privation, not a penalty. It then only held a sickle that mowed down all mortal beings, but was afterwards armed with its sword, and became a retribution.

Such was his leading idea. We shall not follow him into the metaphysical disquisitions by which he defends it. They would be found wearisome and bewildering, and altogether unprofitable, like most other Biblical disquisitions in that vein. They lie through a briery walk and a foggy region, where the obstructions are many, and nothing is to be seen worth the trouble of trying to see. His critical grounds were evidently untenable; though theological scholars are still divided in opinion as to the nature of the law here indicated, whether the Mosaic law or some other was meant, and whether any or what supplementary words need to be interposed, in order completely to represent the Apostle's thought. We need concern ourselves the less about this obscurity, as we are persuaded that every thing beyond the obvious substance of meaning is only the language of rhetoric and parable, in adaptation to the state, at that period, of the Jewish mind.

Isaac la Peyrère may have been fanciful in his interpretations of St. Paul, weak in the texture of much of his reasoning, erroneous in his belief that Adam was designed to represent only the forefather of the Hebrew race, and extravagant in some of his assumptions. He was, however, a learned and ingenious man. He appears to have been sincere in thinking that his speculations would be serviceable rather than detrimental to the advance of true religion. We can believe him, when he says, in the conclusion of his "Discourse," — "Whatever I have here written is done by way of Essay. I will be obstinate in nothing that may contradict the receiv'd Opinion of the Church; to whose commands, I say again intirely, without all dissimulation, I yield myself." He is chargeable sometimes with a simplicity of belief and even a superstitious credulity; for he belonged to his age. But he is more frequently original, far-sighted, modestly bold. His book abounds with wise, sober views of Scripture story, that surprise us with their superiority to the current religious notions of even our own times. The heads of his chapters often exhibit this. Take a few examples. "How Melchizedech is to be understood without father, or mother, or original." "They talk," he says, "of a man-monster, not of a man, who think that he was really without either, only because Moses in no case

makes mention of either." Again: — "Where the miracle is of the Jews garments not worn out in the wilderness, and the not wearing of their shoes." "It is commonly thought," he says, "that God made their clothes incorruptible, as also one occult facultie of growing bigger. Concerning their shoes, that could not grow old; and so soon as they put shoes upon their children's feet, as the feet grew, so the shoes grew likewise. The force of this miracle was not placed in those idle fancies and childish stories, but in that wonderful providence by which God led the Israelites forty years through the Desert, so that they wanted not materials to make clothes and shoes of." And again: — "The darkness at the death of our Saviour was over the whole land of the Jews, not over all the world. The starr which appear'd to the wise men was a stream of light in the ayr, not a star in heaven." With regard to the former of these he pleasantly says, — "Nor was the miracle without a mysterie; for there had been a time when dark night covered all the land of Egypt at the command of Moses, but all the Israelites had light in their dwellings. Now was the day come, at the death of Christ, when the light of the Gospel should appear to the Gentiles; and all the land of the Jews, and the Jews themselves, should be o'rcast with the darknesse of incredulity." With poorer success, he labors hard to show, even from the Mosaic account itself, that Noah's flood was only the submersion of Palestine, for the destruction of no others than the Jews. He endeavours to establish it also from the history of Noah's posterity. He is very anxious to prove that "they are deceiv'd, who deduce the Originals of men from the Grand-children" of that patriarch. He plainly would put back the ante-historical period to an indefinite date, far beyond the antiquity assigned to it by the chronology of the Old Testament, whether by the Hebrew or the Septuagint computation.

When we hear the animated and confident strain that sometimes breaks out in his book, we are ready to doubt whether what we have conceded can be true, that he was first led to adopt his peculiar theory by a difficulty in explaining a passage in one of St. Paul's Epistles. There must have been some other and stronger impulse. What it was we are unable from any thing in his treatise to

discover ; but we cannot help believing that Romans v. 12, 13, 14, served only as subsidiary to it. Indeed, he tells us in his "Proeme," that he had this suspicion from his childhood, whenever he heard or read the history of Genesis ; but that he dared not give utterance to his doubts till he meditated those verses of the Apostle, which he did for about twenty years. He then took heart, and went on courageously. We think we are at liberty to understand by this, that he at last supposed he had found an apostolical authority for recommending a doctrine, which he was before convinced of, but had been afraid to teach. There can be no stronger expression of an unfeigned humility than where he declares, — "If any man shall shew that I contradict the history of Genesis in the least, or any other place of the holy Scripture, or step aside a nail's breadth from any head of Christian faith, I shall not be ashamed to set down my name with capital letters in confessing my fault. My name I do not now mention for modesties sake ; not as conscious of any evil action. I fear lest I should abuse so noble a subject by the slenderness of my Treatise." As a specimen of his zeal, we might quote the beginning of the third book of his "Systeme of Divinity." "But go to, that I may leave nothing unessay'd that may conduce to the clearing of this famous Argument. I'll prove out of Genesis itself, and it shall appear clearer then the sun, that the men of the first Creation were created long before Adam, who is Author of the Linage of the Jews." In one instance, he presents his subject in connection with natural history ; and here he comes into some sort of harmony with our learned Professor in that department of knowledge. "According to the Analogy of creation," is his language, "we must believe, that there was no place in the whole earth which brought forth grass and fostered trees and cattel, which had not its own men and its own lords. God would have seem'd to have created something in vain and inconvenient, if when he ordained these things for the service of men, he had not created men at the same time. To what purpose, else, should the Antipodes bring forth herbs ? For what lord's use should the fruit have hung upon the trees in those Countries ? the cattel of them, whom should they have helped ?" (p. 96.)

Here we take leave of our part in this curious topic. We should not have entered upon it but for the excitement that has attended the treatment of a scientific theory in our pages. Mr. Agassiz is abundantly able to speak for himself, and may do so again through the same channel. We do not by any means put ourselves forward as the advocates of his hypothesis. We neither adopt nor absolutely reject it. Let him set in order the best arguments that he can find in its support, and leave the decision to the judgment of those who are learned in such matters. Meanwhile, we will maintain the rights of liberal scholarship and honest science against all comers. When, indeed, a writer allows himself to accuse the distinguished philosopher, whose papers have given occasion to this article, of making "an attack upon the Christian religion," and of using "scandalous dishonesty in endeavouring to evade its being so considered," we confess that we feel no disposition to resist or resent it. Such inattention to facts and such passionate injustice may be safely left to do their own work upon the offender.

N. L. F.

ART. VI.—REFLECTIONS.

A THEORY serves to connect facts as a string holds together the pearls of a necklace. The theory itself is often as valueless as the string.

Much of the wisdom of one age is the folly of the next.

The reward of well-doing is satisfaction here and happiness hereafter.

Ambitious and unscrupulous men often appropriate to themselves the credit which is due to others, as the bald eagle snatches the fish from the mouth of the fish-hawk.

Is not suffering when it comes usually more endurable than we had imagined it would be? If so, may not the actual amount of suffering in the world be less than we suppose?

The condition of men changes continually, even when it appears most nearly uniform; and if this consideration moderates our expectation of good, it should also moderate our apprehension of evil.

The memory of an old man is a picture-gallery of perished forms; a map of the world, not as it is, but as it was long ago.

The art of the physician consists in a great measure in making hope a substitute for health.

What 's happiness, pray? 'T is a handful of hay
Held out to a horse who won't stir for hard blows;
He stretches to reach it, but, strive as he may,
'T is always some inches in front of his nose.

To scold people when they make confessions is the way to prevent them from confessing again.

As air rushes into vacant space, troubles rush into a vacant soul. And as the smallest quantity of air will expand so as to fill any vacant place, the smallest trouble will fill a vacant soul.

Many improvements so called are merely adaptations to changed circumstances. One change requires another, and this another, and so on. Each of these is called an improvement. But men may be making such improvements perpetually, and yet the amount of good in the world remain about the same.

It is bad to make an unnecessary show of high principles, but it is worse to have no high principles to show.

When we consider the differences of constitution and condition among men, it seems as if spirits were placed here in different stages of progress, requiring diversity of training.

A man of leisure is apt to bestow too much time on minutiae. Most men are compelled to turn from one thing to another so fast, that they cannot waste time on trifles. This pressure is the main cause of their inefficiency. Without what Wordsworth calls "the rich blessings of constraint," men in general would be like Burns, "unfitted with an aim."

Liberal dealing is better than alms-giving; for it tends to prevent pauperism, which is better than to relieve it.

A man too busy to take care of his health is like a mechanic too busy to take care of his tools.

The progress of some men is so rapid, that they keep ahead of common sense.

Accurate knowledge is the basis of correct opinions. The want of it makes most people's opinions of little value.

Ideas overloaded with words seldom travel far or long.

Toil forms the thoughts and polished style that please,
The writer's labor makes the reader's ease.

A man engrossed by one subject while talking of another often says one thing when he means another. Perhaps some contradictory testimony may be accounted for in this way; for a man who has said what he did not mean to say, and is not conscious of having said, will of course be likely to deny that he did say so.

To the question, "What is the object of studying history?" we once heard this answer given. "It is to learn the providence of God."

A man whose mind is trained to find happiness in doing good almost always has the means of happiness at command.

An old creed is often like an old house, decayed and forsaken while it still appears imposing at a distance. Or it is like an old hollow tree; the shell makes a show when the substance is gone. At length, a strong push makes it totter and tumble and crumble to dust.

The child is the mirror of the adult. Men learn their own nature by watching the development of children.

Men are so differently constituted, that external condition is a poor index of happiness. A shoe which fits one man's foot well may grievously pinch another man's.

Facts, facts! cries every pretender to discoveries in physical or intellectual science. But the world is full of

misunderstood, misstated, or pretended facts. Fraud, enthusiasm, and narrowness of view often shape the premises to fit the conclusion.

Men generally take their opinions upon trust, profess them from impulse, and adhere to them from pride. Opinions that have not been professed are often relinquished as easily as they were adopted.

Many brilliant speculations are shining soap-bubbles that turn to nothing as you gaze;—balloons inflated with gas, the less their substance, the higher they soar;—steam from the boiler of a boat lying still, wasted energy, noise without progress.

To confute an opponent is not always to convince him, even if he be fair-minded; for his opinions may rest on grounds that lie deeper than his arguments, and he himself may not have fully investigated them.

Fiat justitia, ruat cælum. A blind application of this maxim is apt to produce the latter result without the former. A being so short-sighted as man, and whose principles are so partial and so conflicting, has no right to leave consequences out of the question. What he thinks clearly right at twenty he may think clearly wrong at forty. Principles which are considered fundamental in one age are exploded in a subsequent one. *Fiat justitia, &c.*, may have been the motto of Torquemada when he burned heretics in Spain, and of Charles the Ninth of France, when he ordered the massacre of St. Bartholomew. The tares and the wheat should often be left to grow together till the harvest.

When an object leaves on the whole an agreeable impression, we are apt to overlook the fact that certain parts or qualities taken out of the connection in which we find them would excite dislike. The young often copy the defects of those whom they like or admire. Many absurd fashions of dress, language, and manners gain currency in this way.

Conscience is the magnetic needle which is given to us to direct our course. Worldly wisdom, like a spy-glass, may show breakers ahead, but cannot guide across the ocean.

To do one's duty may be painful, but it always proves far more painful to neglect or violate it.

The incidental consequences of good or ill doing are often more important than the direct ones. The mere fact of our short-sightedness ought to be sufficient, even without the aid of high motives, to deter us from doing evil that good may come. For even when the good does come, some unexpected evil almost always comes with it. And well-doing, even when it fails of its direct object, is almost sure to produce incidental advantages, which are often of much more value than the good that was aimed at.

The punishment of sin and the reward of virtue sometimes seem excessive. But is not the punishment or the reward usually the consequence of a long course of conduct, of which the particular act that seems to be rewarded or punished makes but a very small part?

We sometimes succeed with little effort, and at other times fail after making great efforts. In the latter case we are apt to complain. But is it not wiser to consider the two classes of results in connection, and say that, putting them together, we have had as much success as we deserved?

The time spent in complaining would often suffice to remedy the evils complained of.

Strict dealing may cool friendship, but loose dealing often converts friends into enemies.

A sound mind finds no pleasure in the weaknesses of others. Whatever lowers our view of man's nature lowers our hope of man's destiny.

We do and avoid much merely to satisfy the imagination. A thousand things insignificant in themselves please or offend by what they suggest.

Moral improvement is made very gradually. Small gains follow great pains.

In a majority of cases, the resenting of an insult directs men's attention to what they would otherwise

hardly notice, teaches the malicious where to strike, furnishes sport for the thoughtless, and degrades a man to the level of his assailant.

A man's associates make his world. As he grows old, they change with him, and he is apt to think that the world has changed, when it is only his world that has changed.

Style in writing, as in the other fine arts, is sometimes injured by elaboration. One does not always know when he has done his best. In the vain attempt to remove all blemishes, he often destroys beauties, and while his work may grow more faultless it grows also more tame.

The definition of "enough"
 Most persons find a problem tough;
 Perhaps the best one given yet
 Is "something more than one can get."

There is no limit to the combinations of ideas and shades of meaning that may be expressed by words. Every language has many terms which have none corresponding to them in other languages. For the different circumstances of different nations have led each to invent words expressing ideas which other nations have had no occasion to express. Hence one of the great difficulties in the way of translating poetry and philosophy.

The strength of man increases with the knowledge of his weakness.

It is desirable to satisfy others, but it is much more desirable to satisfy one's self.

The basis of order in most European countries has been a state religion. In our country it is a state education. For church and state we have substituted school and state.

Don't throw away the good that you can have for the good that you cannot have. Use your abilities, not your inabilities. Take no unnecessary risk, and decline no proper one.

To be a fool and not to know it is a double misfortune.

Superiority to the love of distinction is the source of the highest distinction. Those whose ruling motive is popular applause are the followers of the multitude. The multitude knows this and despises them accordingly.

Trust God in whom you live and move,
As infants trust a parent's love.

It is mortifying to think how life slips through one's fingers.

Good and evil are inseparable companions, but the latter often hides behind the back of the former. Pride and self-interest make men conceal the evils of their lot. Hence each one is apt to think others more fortunate than himself, and hence a restless love of change. But we learn by experience that there is much less difference than we had supposed in the distribution of good and evil, and that the best standard of happiness is virtue.

Dark was the night when might made right,
But darkness now holds doubtful sway,
And freedom's watch-word, "Right makes might,"
Tells far and wide of dawning day.

Excitement produces rapid exhaustion and prevents ready apprehension. Ideas enter the mind in the form of slight suggestions. These a calm mind seizes upon, but an agitated mind overlooks.

A feeling of pain or shame associated with some familiar object, and frequently suggested by it, often proves a salutary incentive to improvement, giving lasting good for transient ill.

Some substitute for the payment of debts has been a desideratum from time immemorial.

E. W.

ART. VII.—DR. HOWE'S REPORTS UPON IDIOCY.*

WHEN the project of instructing idiots was first proposed, we confess we were among the number of those who regarded it as in the highest degree visionary. We had, with the rest of the world, been in the habit of considering idiocy as absolutely irremediable. We looked upon an idiot as hardly a human being; and, while we sympathized with the mother and friends of such a being, in their hopeless despair, would or could offer no consolation, for we had no hope ourselves. But the facts presented in the Reports before us, the light thrown upon the whole subject by Dr. Howe in this country, and by several distinguished men on the continent of Europe, and, above all, the success which has uniformly attended persevering attempts to improve the condition of idiots, have obliged us to change our views, and to look upon the attempt now making in this State with the greatest interest. With these Reports, we propose to trace the steps by which we have been brought to more hopeful views of the subject; and we trust that whoever will accompany us will be led to similar conclusions.

“In the winter of 1845–46, several gentlemen became interested in the sad condition of the idiots in the State, and, without any precise knowledge of what had been done for such persons elsewhere, or what could be done, determined that a fair trial should be made of the capacity of this unhappy class for improvement. The State had most readily and generously seconded the efforts of humane men for the relief of the insane, the deaf mutes, and the blind, and made ample provision for their care and instruction. While, like a wise parent, she left all her other children to wholesome liberty and strengthening self-control, she gathered these feeble ones under the wings of her moth-

* 1. *A Report, in part, made by the Commissioners appointed under the Resolve of the 11th of April, 1846, “To inquire into the Condition of the Idiots of the Commonwealth; to ascertain their Number, and whether any Thing can be done for their Relief.” Together with a Letter from George Sumner upon the Subject of the School for Idiots in Paris.* Being House Document, No. 152. March 31, 1847. pp. 20.

2. *Report made to the Legislature of Massachusetts, upon Idiocy.* By S. G. Howz, Chairman of the State Commission. Being Senate Document, No. 51. Feb. 26, 1848. Coolidge & Wiley. pp. 100. Appendix, with Statistical Tables and Minute Details. pp. 46.

3. *Dr. Howz's Report on Idiocy, 1850.* Being Senate Document, No. 38. Feb. 20, 1850. pp. 72.

erly love, and nursed and nurtured them with unsparing pains and care. Nothing had been done for the most wretched and helpless of all, — the idiots; but this was only because their case seemed hopeless. Their bodies were fed and clad. As for minds, they seemed to have none. They were therefore kept out of sight of the public, as beings, the presence of whom seemed only to do harm to the beholders. It was thought desirable to ignore their very existence, as much as possible; and little was known of their number and condition. If it had been certain that nothing could be done to improve them, this course would have been, in some respects, wise; for the sight of any human being in a state of brutishness is demoralizing to unreflecting beholders.

“The first thing to be done, in the plan for their improvement, was to gather together the necessary knowledge concerning their number and condition, in a form that could be depended upon; and the Legislature was persuaded to pass a Resolve, on the 11th day of April, 1846, appointing Commissioners ‘to inquire into the condition of the idiots of the Commonwealth, — to ascertain their number, and whether any thing can be done in their behalf.’” — *Report of 1850*, pp. 2, 3.

The Commissioners appointed by the Governor were S. G. Howe, Horatio Byington, and Gilman Kimball. In their first Report they do little more than state the manner in which they propose to perform the duties assigned them. This was, —

“1st. By addressing a circular containing a list of questions to the town clerk of each town in the Commonwealth.

“2d. By inspecting, personally, as many idiots as possible, in order to ascertain their condition and capacity, so as to be able to form a more just estimate of the whole.

“3d. By obtaining accurate and minute information concerning the schools which have been recently and successfully established in France, Prussia, and Switzerland.” — *Report of 1847*, p. 2.

Some of the facts which they obtained, from personal inspection of the condition of idiots, were of an encouraging character. The welfare of these poor creatures was found to depend, in a very great degree, upon the intelligence of those who had charge of them. When under the care of ignorant people, they were found in a degraded and disgusting state, little above the level of the brutes.

“In other towns, idiots, who to all appearance had no more

capacity than those just mentioned, were under the charge of more intelligent persons, and they presented a different spectacle, — they were healthy, cleanly, and industrious.

“ We found some, of a very low grade of intellect, at work in the fields, under the direction of attendants; and they seemed not only to be free from depraving habits, but to be happy and useful.

“ The inference to be drawn from this is very important. If persons having only common sense and common humanity, but without the advantage of experience or study, can so improve the condition of idiots, how much could be done by those who should bring the light of science, and the experience of wise and good men in other countries, and the facilities of an institution adapted to the training of idiots, — how much, we say, could be done by such persons towards redeeming the minds of this unfortunate class from the waste and desolation in which they now lie ! ” — *Report of 1847, p. 3.*

This Report is accompanied by a most valuable letter from Mr. George Sumner, of Paris.

The second Report contains a faithful and thorough investigation into the nature, causes, and various forms of idiocy, and a full report upon the condition and treatment of idiots in almshouses and private families, in Massachusetts. The Appendix to this Report gives tables of the bodily and physical condition, general state and capacities, and, so far as they could be ascertained, the hereditary tendencies, of 574 idiotic persons, and various measurements of the height, head, and chest, conditions of body, and manifestation of mind, of these persons, compared with the average, in these particulars, of 1,000 ordinary persons. It also gives some account of what has been done in some of the best European schools for idiots.

This Report led to a series of Resolves by the Legislature, entitled “ Resolves concerning Training and Teaching Idiots,” which were approved May 8, 1848, and by which a sum not exceeding \$2,500, annually, for the term of three years, was appropriated for the purpose of training and teaching ten idiotic children, to be selected from those at public charge or from the families of indigent persons in different parts of the Commonwealth, “ provided that an arrangement can be made by the Governor and Council with any suitable institution now patronized by the Commonwealth for charitable purposes.”

"Agreeably to the spirit of these resolutions, arrangements were made by the Governor with the Trustees of the Institution for the Blind, to assume the responsibility for the proper expenditure of the money appropriated by the State.

"As the plan was conceived in the spirit of humanity, and in view of the good of a most unhappy class of men, the trustees were willing that every aid which their Institution could afford, without injustice to the blind, should be given freely; and, for my part, as head of the Institution, I was glad to devote to this kindred work all the time and attention that could be spared from other duties.

"There was more fitness, perhaps, in the selection than was apparent at first sight. The enterprise was new. None of the common schools of the State could undertake the task of teaching idiots, because they had not the means of proper *training*, which must precede such teaching. The State Asylum for Lunatics had no proper accommodation for a separate class of youth, and no school for their instruction.

"There had been, in this Institution, rare opportunities for teaching persons whose peculiar infirmities cut them off from access to common modes of instruction. There had been also several cases where blindness was accompanied with feebleness of intellect approaching to idiocy; and the degree of success which had crowned the effort to instruct the sufferers gave a portion of the knowledge and faith necessary to those who would have the management of the new experiment. To this, perhaps, should be added, — what, even without any consideration, would show the fitness of the measure, — that it did not seem to be the duty of any one in particular to undertake what was generally deemed a hopeless task; and that none coveted it for themselves." — *Report of 1850*, p. 21.

As the experiment had been suggested by Dr. Howe, the care of carrying it out was properly intrusted to him. His preëminent success in the management of Laura Bridgman and others wanting in nearly all the external senses, and the philosophical spirit he had shown in investigating the causes of blindness and other similar visitations of God's providence, pointed him out as the most suitable person to have charge of this most important experiment. Whoever will read the Reports we are considering will find the amplest evidence of the propriety of the selection.

The third Report goes somewhat fully into the objects which should be aimed at in the training of idiots, the mode of conducting the work, the establishment of a

school, in connection with the Asylum for the Blind, and the success, so far as can be yet shown, which has attended the experiment now making by order of the Legislature.

The first recorded attempt to educate an idiot was made about the year 1800, by Itard, a disciple of Condillac, upon a boy found wild in a forest in France and known as the savage of Aveyron. It was made for the purpose of proving the truth of the sensualist theory, that all ideas, and consequently the character, are produced by sensations excited in the body. The experiment failed, as the wild boy proved to be only an idiot. Itard, obliged to abandon his experiment and perhaps his theory, was too humane to abandon his pupil; and his efforts, perseveringly continued for more than five years, showed what might be done for idiots; and his ideas were afterwards carried out by the amiable and excellent Séguin, who had the good fortune to assist in these original labors.

In 1828, M. Ferrus, President of the Academy of Medicine, and Inspector-General of the Lunatic Asylum of France, organized a school for the more intelligent among the idiots at the Bicêtre, one of the principal hospitals for the insane in Paris, for the purpose of having them taught to read, write, and cipher, and trained in habits of order and cleanliness. His benevolence and success excited, about the same time, M. Falret to make a similar attempt to teach some idiotic females at the Salpêtrière, the other great asylum in Paris.

In 1833, Dr. Voisin, who had investigated the phenomena of idiocy more fully than any other individual, and had published several very valuable treatises upon the subject, attempted to organize a school for idiots in one of the Asylums Rue de Sèvres, and, in 1834, opened a private school with the same object.

“ In 1839, he was made physician to the great hospital of the Bicêtre, and, aided by Dr. Leuret, he renewed and enlarged the school for idiots, of which he still has the general superintendance, the principal teacher being M. Vallée. It is due, however, to Edward Séguin, to say, that to him more than to any other person seems to be owing the great and rapid improvement which has been made in the *art* of teaching and training idiots. He had occupied himself with the subject for several

years, and in 1842 took the immediate management of the school at Bicêtre, which, however, he did not retain. He has labored with that enthusiasm and zeal in a beloved subject, which almost always insure success. He has put forth a degree of courage, energy, and perseverance, which, if exerted in the art of destroying men and cities, would have covered his breast with those crosses and decorations and tawdry bawbles, so highly prized by vulgar minds." — *Report of 1848*, p. 37.

In May, 1843, a committee of three persons, Serres, Flourens, and Pariset, the latter acting as chairman, was appointed to report upon a memoir laid before the Academy of Sciences by Séguin, on a mode of education suited to young idiots and simpletons. The report was presented to the Academy in the following December.

To give an idea of the condition and character of the idiots, and of the difficulties which M. Séguin would have to encounter, Pariset, in his Report, introduces us to the asylum in which the poor creatures are assembled, when Séguin first comes amongst them as their future teacher.

"What a sight! One is jumping about, bellowing and crying out; another is crouching in a corner, as silent and motionless as a statue. The first one whom you address runs chattering away; the next keeps bowing to you, and kissing his hand; a third makes signs of the cross all over his body; a fourth lies flat upon the floor; a fifth gnaws his fingers and laughs wildly."

"Not one can give an intelligible answer to your questions, so inarticulate is their voice. Further on are more hopeless idiots, — blind, epileptic, paralyzed. . . . Eyes have they, but they see not; ears have they, but they hear not. Their legs are unfit for standing, balancing the body, — for walking, leaping, or running. Their hands are unfit for feeling, seizing, or moving things." — *Report of 1848*, p. 38. .

"In idiots those primitive tendencies, those original dispositions, aptitudes, tastes, impulses, wills, which form the nature of the individual, and the character, properly so called, show themselves without disguise. They are not masked by the suggestions of mind. The absence of intelligence brings them out in all their prominence. On the slightest acquaintance with idiots, we do not fail to discover, that, if some are gentle, modest, sincere, docile, unaffected, generous, frank, others are hard, obstinate, wily, deceitful, envious, rapacious, cruel, and, strange as

it may seem, full of vanity, haughtiness, and even pride, that lowest attribute, which, of all faults, is the most dangerous and most anti-social. In each individual may be found united, in different degrees, qualities contrary and inconsistent, forming those odd combinations which we so often find in the world, but which there are so artfully concealed."

"If this picture is not overdrawn; if an idiot of the lowest kind is only an assemblage of physical, intellectual, and moral deformities, mere ignorance, brutishness, and perverseness, it follows that to undertake his education is the most revolting and painful task, — a task incomparably more complex and difficult than that of deaf mutes or the blind. . . . Who would not have been affrighted by such a combination of difficulties united and strengthening each other?"

"Yet these extreme difficulties, we are happy to be able to declare, M. Séguin has in a great degree surmounted. Gymnastic exercises, properly varied, have given to their muscles greater and more uniform power. As their senses become better exercised, their movements have more accuracy and precision; so that they have learned to subject the action of the organs to the will, a faculty unknown to them before. By methods of instruction peculiarly his own, the details of which would be here out of place, he has brought his pupils to a knowledge of the alphabet, of reading, writing, drawing, and the elements of arithmetic and geometry. By making them compare the different sensible qualities of bodies, he has rendered them familiar with abstract ideas of figure, color, density, weight, &c., and with ideas of a higher class of relations, such as order, authority, obedience, duty. By thus habituating his pupils to exercises of body and of mind, he has made them more robust and more intelligent. He has successfully withdrawn them from their secret and pernicious habits, and will perhaps succeed in causing them to be forgotten; for each human being having only a certain amount of the power of action, the more he gives to labor, the more he withdraws from his evil propensities."

The subsequent progress of this school, and the condition of some others, are given in the letter from Mr. George Sumner.

“During the past six months, I have watched, with eager interest, the progress which many young idiots have made, in Paris, under the direction of M. Séguin, and, at Bicêtre, under that of Messrs. Voisin and Vallée, and have seen, with no less gratification than astonishment, nearly one hundred fellow-beings who, but a short time since, were shut out from all communion with mankind, who were objects of loathing and disgust, many of whom rejected every article of clothing, others of whom, unable to stand erect, crouched themselves in corners, and gave signs of life only by piteous howls, others in whom the faculty of speech had never been developed, and many whose voracious and indiscriminate gluttony satisfied itself with whatever they could lay hands upon, with the garbage thrown to swine, — these unfortunate beings, the rejected of humanity, I have seen properly clad, standing erect, walking, speaking, eating in an orderly manner at a common table, working quietly as carpenters and farmers; gaining, by their own labor, the means of existence; storing their awakened intelligence by reading one to another; exercising towards their teachers and among themselves the generous feelings of man's nature, and singing, in unison, songs of thanksgiving!

“The fact is now clearly established, that idiots may be educated, *that the reflective power exists within them, and may be awakened by a proper system of instruction*; that they may be raised, from the filth in which they grovel, to the attitude of men; that they may be taught different arts which will enable them to gain an honest livelihood; and that, although their intelligence may never, perhaps, be developed to such a point as to render them the authors of those generous ideas and great deeds which leave a stamp upon an age, yet still they may attain a respectable mediocrity, and surpass, in mental power, the common peasant of many European states.” — *Report of 1848*, pp. 39, 40.

This school was visited in 1844 by Dr. John Conolly, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, and Physician to the County Lunatic Asylum at Hanwell, England. Dr. Conolly was admirably qualified to form an opinion upon the treatment of cases of disordered and deficient intellect, having been for many years devoted to this good work, and being distinguished for his acquaintance with the subject, and for his intelligence, and his well-tryed and consistent benevolence. We extract largely from a letter addressed by him to Dr. J. Forbes, editor of the *British and Foreign Medical Review*, in the January number of which for 1845 it appeared.

We premise the extracts most apposite to our imme-

diate purpose by a paragraph in an earlier part of the letter, in which Dr. Conolly speaks of the effects produced by the care taken at the Salpêtrière, which asylum he also most carefully examined, of a particular class of poor and hopeless patients.

“ Nothing does more honor to an asylum than the care and protection it extends to the imbecile and helpless. These unhappy beings may be neglected to a great degree with impunity; and that in the old asylums they were grievously so is too well known. Among the objects which gratify me in every visit to Hanwell, none is more entirely satisfactory than the extreme attention paid to the most helpless of the patients, the imbecile, the idiotic, the paralyzed, and all who have fallen into the utmost weakness of mind and body; a state in which they possess no interest for the ordinary spectator, whom they neither alarm by fury nor amaze by eccentricity. Unlike the less heavily afflicted, they can neither appeal to the philanthropy of the visitor, nor to the authority of inspectors; and they would be lost if no compassion were excited by their very wretchedness and squalor, which, however, long pleaded silently and in vain. Among these are not a few whom the physician has traced through successive stages of mental and bodily decay, from the first storm of unreason to the last wreck of sense and intelligence, and who, he knows, can have no friend on this side of the grave if he ceases to be such. It is these abject creatures who have been rescued, by the active benevolence prevailing in asylums, from a state in which it was thought impossible to produce them to decent view. Many a wretch, heretofore doomed to lie in hopeless neglect, is now daily dressed in clean and warm clothing, and brought out of his bed to sit by the fire, or to breathe the fresh and invigorating air. A feeble smile of recognition still passes over the features of these poor, declining patients, and not a few of them utter words expressive of their content. They are reduced to the condition of children, and they are treated as children, fed as children, kept clean like children, put into bed like children; they are only not punished like children; but are guarded by night and by day from danger, violence, or neglect, until their poor remains of life can be husbanded no longer.” — p. 287.

“ I was accompanied round this asylum [the Bicêtre] by M. Battelle and by M. Mallon, the director, and had afterwards an opportunity of hearing from himself the exposition of the views of one of its able physicians, M. Voisin, whose singular zeal in the cause of the idiotic class of patients has caused difficulties to be overcome which appeared at first to be insurmountable. The first part of the Bicêtre to which I was conducted was a school

exclusively established for the improvement of these cases, and of the epileptic, and nothing more extraordinary can be well imagined.

“No fewer than forty of these patients were assembled in a moderate-sized school-room, receiving various lessons and performing various evolutions under the direction of a very able schoolmaster, M. Séguin, himself a pupil of the celebrated Itard, and endowed with that enthusiasm respecting his occupation before which difficulties vanish. His pupils had been all taught to sing to music, and the little band of violins and other instruments, by which they were accompanied, was formed of the old almsmen of the hospital. But all the idiotic part of this remarkable class also sang without any musical accompaniment, and kept excellent time and tune. They sang several compositions, and among others a very pretty song written for them by M. Batelle, and sung by them on entering the class-room. Both the epileptic and idiotic were taught to write, and their copy-books would have done credit to any writing-school for young persons. Numerous exercises were gone through, of a kind of military character, with perfect correctness and precision. The youngest of the class was a little idiot boy of five years old, and it was interesting to see him following the rest, and imitating their actions, holding out his right arm, left arm, both arms, marching to the right and left, at the word of command and to the sound of a drum, beaten, with all the lively skill of a French drummer, by another idiot, who was gratified by wearing a demi-military uniform. All these exercises were gone through by a collection of beings offering the smallest degree of intellectual promise, and usually left, in all asylums, in total indolence and apathy. Amongst them was one youth whose intellectual deficiency was marked in every look, gesture, and feature. I think a more particular account of this poor boy's progress deserving of record, as an inducement to the philanthropist to enter on a new field of instruction presenting many difficulties, but yet not unproductive of results.

“The age of Charles Emile is fifteen : he was admitted to the school in June, 1843. He is described as being of a nervous and sanguine temperament, and in an almost complete state of idiocy ; the faculties which remain being in a state of extraordinary activity, and rendering him dangerous to himself and to others ; but still idiotic in his inclinations, sentiments, perceptions, faculties of perception and understanding, and also in his senses, of which some were obtuse, and others too excitable. He was consequently unfit, to use the words of M. Voisin, to ‘harmonize with the world without.’ As regards his *inclinations*, he was signalized by a voracious, indiscriminate, gluttonous appetite, and

a blind and terrible instinct of destruction. He was wholly an animal. He was without attachment; overturned every thing in his way, but without courage or intent; possessed no tact, intelligence, power of dissimulation, or sense of property; and was awkward to excess. His *moral sentiments* are described as *null*, except the love of approbation, and a noisy instinctive gayety, independent of the external world. As to his *senses*, his eyes were never fixed, and seemed to act without his will; his taste was depraved; his touch obtuse; his ear recognized sounds, but was not attracted by any sound in particular; and he scarcely seemed to be possessed of the sense of smell; devouring every thing, however disgusting; brutally sensual; passionate, — breaking, tearing, and burning whatever he could lay his hands upon; and if prevented from doing so, pinching, biting, scratching, and tearing himself, until he was covered with blood. He had the particularity of being so attracted by the eyes of his brothers, sisters, and playfellows, as to make the most persevering efforts to push them out with his fingers. He walked very imperfectly, and could neither run, leap, nor exert the act of throwing; sometimes he sprang like a leopard, and his delight was to strike one sonorous body against another. When any attempt was made to associate him with the other patients, he would start away with a sharp cry, and then come back to them hastily. M. Voisin's description concludes with these expressions: — 'All the faculties of perception in this youth are in a rudimentary state; and, if I may venture so to express myself, it is incredibly difficult to draw him out of his individuality, to place him before exterior objects, and to make him take any notice of them. It would not be far from the truth to say, that for him all nature is almost completely veiled.'

"This description not only exemplifies M. Voisin's careful mode of observation, but shows that an example of idiocy less favorable to culture could scarcely have been presented to the instructor. This same poor idiot boy is now docile in his manners, decent in his habits, and capable, though not without some visible effort, of directing his vague senses and wandering attention, so as to have developed his memory, to have acquired a limited instruction concerning various objects, and to have become affectionately conscious of the presence of his instructors and friends. His general appearance is still that of an idiot. His countenance, his mode of walking, all that he does, declare his very limited faculties. Nature has placed limits to the exercise of his powers, which no art can remove. But he is redeemed from the constant dominion of the lowest animal propensities. Several of his intellectual faculties are cultivated; some have even been called into life; and his better feelings have acquired

some objects and some exercise. In such a case as this, we are not so much to regard what is merely accomplished for the individual. A great principle is established by it in favor of thousands of defective organizations. After witnessing the general efforts of this school of the most imbecile human beings, and hearing the particulars of Charles Emile's history, it was really affecting to see him come forward when called, and essay to sing a little solo when requested; his attempt at first not being quite successful, but amended by his attention being more roused to it. His copy-book was then shown to me, and his writing was steady, and as good as that of most youths in his station in life. The schoolmaster, who seemed to take pleasure in the improvement of this poor fellow, then showed us how he had taught Charles to count, by means of marbles and small pieces of wood, or marks made on a board, arranged in lines, the first containing an O, the second O O, the third O O O, and so on. Charles was sometimes out in his first calculations, but then made an effort and rectified himself. He distinguished one figure from another, naming their value. Large pieces of strong card, of various shapes, were placed in succession in his hands; and he named the figure of each, as, square, triangle, &c., &c., and afterwards drew their outlines with chalk on a blackboard; and, according to the desire of M. Séguin, drew a perpendicular, or horizontal, or oblique line; so effectually attending to what he was doing, that, if any line was drawn incorrectly, he rubbed it out and began anew. He also wrote several words on the board, and the name of the director of Bicêtre, without the name being spoken to him.

"This case was altogether the most interesting of those which I saw; but there was one poor idiot standing a great part of the time in a corner, to all appearance the very despair of art; even this poor creature, however, upon being noticed and brought to the table, proved capable of distinguishing the letters of the alphabet. Most of the others had received as much instruction as has been described, and could count, draw lines and figures, write, perform various exercises, and point to different parts of the body, as the head, the eyes, the arms, the feet, &c., &c., when named to them. In all these cases, and preëminently in that of Charles Emile, the crowning glory of the attempt is, that whilst the senses, the muscular powers, and the intellect have received some cultivation, the habits have been improved, the propensities regulated, and some play has been given to the affections; so that a wild, ungovernable animal, calculated to excite fear, aversion, or disgust, has been transformed into the likeness and manners of a man. It is difficult to avoid falling into the language of enthusiasm on beholding such an apparent miracle; but the means of its performance are simple, demanding

only that rare perseverance, without which nothing good or great is ever effected, and suitable space, and local arrangements adapted to the conservation of the health and safety of the pupils, to the establishment of cleanly habits, to presenting them with objects for the exercise of their faculties of sense, motion, and intellect, and to the promotion of good feelings and a cheerful, active disposition. The idiot who is capable of playing and amusing himself is already, as M. Séguin observes, somewhat improved. I can but regret that I had not time to watch the progress of this interesting school from day to day, and to trace the growth of knowledge in the different pupils; as, of the first ideas of form and color into writing and drawing; the development of articulation into the power of verbal expression; the extension of memory to calculation; the subsidence of gross propensities, and springing forth and flourishing of virtuous emotions, in a soil where, if even under the most favorable circumstances the blossoms and fruits are few, but for philanthropic culture all would be noxious or utterly barren."

Dr. Howe gives an account of the remarkable school for the instruction of idiots, especially those called Cretins, established on the Abdenberg, in Switzerland, by Dr. Guggenbühl, whose success he describes as gratifying beyond measure. After noticing briefly a school for the instruction of idiots in Prussia and another in England, he concludes with an earnest recommendation that, in the State of Massachusetts, "*measures be at once taken to rescue this most unfortunate class from the dreadful degradation in which they now grovel.*"

The school for the instruction of idiots in this State was organized, in connection with the Asylum for the Blind, at South Boston, in the autumn of 1848. Thirteen poor boys, from the age of six to that of fourteen years, were brought together, and placed under the charge of a well qualified instructor, as in a family. Mrs. McDonald, "a kind and motherly person, and most efficient house-keeper, was engaged as matron, and she, with intelligent domestics, made arrangements for receiving the children into a clean, comfortable, and pleasant home."

Dr. Howe divides all idiots, for the purpose of convenient arrangement, into three classes, founded upon the degree of their privation of intellect,—*simpletons* being the highest, *fools* the next, and *idiots* proper the lowest. In the school as first gathered there were some of each class.

When the last Report to which we have referred was made, this school had been in operation but little more than a year, a time hardly long enough to authorize any one to pronounce very decidedly upon the success of the experiment. Some facts, however, are stated of a highly encouraging character.

Speaking of the effect of severity and harshness in the treatment of children of feeble intellect, Dr. Howe says:—

“A case which illustrates the effect of this kind of treatment may be mentioned here, though a little out of place. My attention being called, a short time ago, to a boy, said to be idiotic and unmanageable, I went to his father's house to see him. It was a dilapidated and dirty room, dimly lighted, and intensely heated by a cooking-stove. There were several children, all of them dirty, but all decently clad, except one, a boy of thirteen, who was literally covered with rags. On opening the door, this boy ran skulking away, and hid himself behind the cooking-stove. He soon peered out, with a look of great terror, as if in fear for his life, or of a severe whipping. By degrees, and with great care, I got near him, though he trembled greatly, and would, occasionally, dart away from one corner of the room to another. When not running, he moved about with the stealthy tread of a cat, putting down his foot as carefully as if treading on ice, which he feared would break under him, and keeping his eyes fixed upon me. After long attempts to quiet him, and assure him, he was induced to take from my hand an apple, which he ran away with, and began to devour most voraciously. It was very unusual for him to show even so much confidence in a stranger. He commonly ran from any one who came in; and, if approached, he would scream aloud, and be convulsed with terror. It was considered remarkable, that he at last, very timidly, gave me the tip of his finger to shake hands at my departure.”— *Report of 1850*, p. 39.

This account is confirmed by a letter from Mr. Downer, the gentleman who had first drawn Dr. Howe's attention to the boy. The Report goes on:—

“This boy was quite unmanageable, by any means within reach of his father or friends. They knew no way to make him obey, but that of force and blows. He was formerly a tolerably bright boy, but he had been in this sad condition for years, and was rapidly growing worse. He seemed to live in continual terror, and seldom spoke a word. The first time that I heard him utter a word was one day when his father took hold of him, to make him obey some command, upon which, with his knees

fairly knocking, and his body trembling all over, he screamed convulsively, — ‘Will-good boy! Will-good boy!’ This was enough to show, that, whatever might have been the first cause of his strange condition, the daily treatment he was receiving was gradually crushing his feeble intellect, and would tend to drive him into hopeless idiocy, or insanity. And yet his father was a sober, well-meaning man, and not a cruel parent. He simply did not know how to govern his own feelings, and to *train* those of this unfortunate child. The boy was therefore taken into our school at once. He has been there but a few weeks, and the change in him is already most remarkable. He is still a little shy, but he has lost all appearance of terror; he not only comes readily when called, but often goes up to those belonging to the house, and puts his arms affectionately about them, and returns their caresses. He takes his place in the class, and strives to imitate all the motions of the scholars, and obey the signs of the teacher. He can select the letters of the alphabet, and understands a few words. He is obedient and docile, and tries hard to learn with the others. He is affectionate, and much gratified by any mark of praise or approval. He begins to talk, and is rapidly improving in every respect.

“The following letter, from Mr. Downer, will show how much, in the opinion of that gentleman, he has improved, under the treatment he has received, in his new home. The improvement is mainly attributable to the spirit of gentleness, which pervades the household. This has quieted all his terrors, and soothed his spirit, so that he is able to give attention to the judicious instruction which Mr. Richards imparts to him.

“ *Boston, February, 14, 1850.*

“ ‘DR. S. G. HOWE: —

“ ‘DEAR SIR, — I availed myself, to-day, of your invitation, to visit the Institution for the benefit of the Feeble-minded, that I might have an opportunity of witnessing the improvement (if any) of the boy, Michael Mah, who has been enjoying its privileges; but I hardly know how to comply with your request, to communicate how his present appearance struck me, as compared to that which he exhibited before being placed there. When I remember his former wild, and almost frantic demeanour, when approached by any one, and the apparent impossibility of communicating with him, and now see him standing in his class, playing with his fellows, and willingly and familiarly approaching me, examining what I gave him, — and when I see him, already, selecting articles named by his teacher, and even correctly pronouncing some words printed on cards, — improvement does not convey the idea presented to my mind; — it is creation; it is making him anew.

“ I also noticed an entire change in his manner of moving his hands, and whole body. In truth, as he stood in his class, it was with difficulty I recognized him, so changed was his appearance. I was struck, particularly, by the fresh and healthy appearance of his skin and complexion, which, formerly, was pale and haggard.

“ If, Sir, he is a fair sample of what training and education can do for idiots, I can only say, God speed you in your endeavours to build up such an institution ; it has but to be known to be appreciated, and to have the views of its founders carried into successful operation.” — *Ibid.*, pp. 40–42.

The next case of which we shall quote the particulars is that of a child in a very low state of idiocy.

“ Sylvanus Walker, aged six years ; height, or rather length, for he had never learned to stand upright, was three feet four inches ; weight, thirty-one pounds.

“ The cause of his idiocy, according to his mother's account, was mismanagement. Soon after his birth, a neighbour, who was kindly acting as nurse and assistant, took the poor babe close to a hot stove, and began to rub its head with *strong rum*, warming his head by the stove, in order to make it soak in the rum the better, and rubbing with her hand, diligently, for a long time, until a whole teacupful had been used. Of course, a considerable portion must have been absorbed, and the effect upon the nervous system was very powerful. The babe slept profoundly, and could not be aroused until the third day !

“ When brought to our school, his senses were very inactive and dull ; his eyes were languid in their expression, — almost vacant indeed, and very slow in their motions ; his hearing was, apparently, more active than his sight, for, while he rarely noticed visible objects, he showed some liveliness and interest in musical sounds. Touch, or rather tactile sensibility, was almost wanting in his hands, and other parts of his body.

“ He had no power of locomotion whatever ; he could not stand upon his feet, nor sit up alone in a chair, nor even creep on his hands and knees. He lay quietly upon the floor, or wherever they placed him, by the hour together, or even all day long ; and made no other movement than, once in a while, to raise his head upon his hand, with his elbow resting on the floor. In this posture, he sometimes played with any bright thing that came within the reach of his other hand. This was the extent of his amusement. He had no other occupation, save that of eating, or rather drinking, for he *could not chew* solid food, and was nourished mainly upon milk, of which he consumed large quantities ; his mother said, sometimes nearly a gallon a day. He had not

learned to feed himself at all. He had no more sense of decency, when brought to us, than an infant.

“In respect to intellect, he was an idiot. He could not speak a dozen words, and not even those distinctly. He had no knowledge, no desires, no affections.

“At an age when other boys were at school, or at their sports, this poor little fellow lay motionless upon the floor, or bed, or wherever they placed him, without amusement, and without occupation; and so he would probably have lain during all the years of his youth. He would not have learned to creep, or to talk, had he lived to the age of manhood, for his limbs were powerless, and his parents did not know how to strengthen them, nor how to teach him language.

“The change and improvement caused in this boy's condition, by one year's training, have been most gratifying. He has been bathed daily in cold water; his limbs have been rubbed; he has been dragged about in the open air, in a little wagon, by the other boys; his muscles have been exercised; he has been made to grasp with his hands, and gradually to raise himself up by them. He was held up, and made to bear a little of his weight upon his lower limbs,—then a little more, until, at last, to his great delight, he was able to go about alone, by holding on the wall, or to one's finger; even to go up stairs, by clinging to the balusters. He can go round a large table, by merely resting one hand on the edge of it. The like improvement has taken place in his habits; he is observant of decency; he calls, when he wants any assistance; he can sit at the table, and chew his food, and even feed himself pretty well.

“His cheeks begin to glow with color; his eye is much brighter; he gives attention to what is passing around him; and his whole countenance is more expressive of thought. His improvement in language is equally great; he has learned many words, and can construct many simple sentences. His affections begin to be developed, and he manifests his attachment to persons by unmistakable signs. During an absence of several weeks, he did not forget his teacher, and used to show to his mother, that he wanted to see Mr. Richards. Such is the effect of a year's training; and it is but the beginning, for this boy will doubtless go on improving, and advancing more rapidly for every step heretofore gained. He was put down on the list as an idiot of the lowest kind, for he was quite in an idiotic condition, nor was there any means of knowing his latent capacities; it will not be surprising, however, if he should be raised, not only to the highest grade of idiots, or simpletons, but even lifted quite above that class.”—*Ibid.*, pp. 46—48.

This case is given to show, that

"It is not merely desirable, but it is sometimes absolutely necessary, to commence the instruction of idiots with physical training, for some of them have never had their muscular system developed at all." — *Ibid.*, p. 46.

"The result, thus far, seems to be most gratifying and encouraging. Of the whole number received, there was not one who was in a situation where any great improvement in his condition was probable, or hardly possible; they were growing worse in habits, and more confirmed in their idiocy. The process of deterioration in the pupils has been entirely stopped; — that of improvement has commenced; and, though a year is a very short time in the instruction of such persons, yet its effects are manifest in all of them.

"They have all improved in personal appearance and habits, in general health, in vigor, and in activity of body. Some of them can control their own appetites in a considerable degree; they sit at the table with the teachers, and feed themselves decently. Almost all of them have improved in the understanding and the use of speech. Some of them have made considerable progress in the knowledge of language; they can select words printed on slips of paper; and a few can read simple sentences. They have gained a knowledge of many objects, their names, colors, forms, dimensions, &c. But what is most important, they have *made a start forward*. They have begun to give their attention to things; to observe qualities, and to exercise thought. The mental machinery has been put in operation, and it will go on more easily, and more rapidly, in future, because the greatest difficulty, that of getting into motion from a state of rest, was overcome when it began to move." — *Ibid.*, p. 71.

Such are some of the effects which had been already produced, in the autumn of last year.

A visit made to this school in November, 1850, after it had been in operation a little more than two years, shows that the progress has been continued, and presents, altogether, a most surprising and gratifying sight. The school, with respect to every child there except one, who was admitted the previous day, seems as quiet, as decent, as orderly, and almost as attentive, as a well-taught common school for intelligent children.

One boy, who, when he came under the charge of his patient, gentle, persevering teacher, could not, to save his life, lift his hand to his head, and could not even chew his food, but had always had it chewed and put into his mouth by his mother, now gets up from his seat, where he has been quietly sitting, walks, awkwardly indeed,

across the room, takes his seat by a desk, picks out words printed on cards, and, although he cannot articulate them, points to or touches *desk, head, hair, apron*, which the words stand for, and shows the delight with which he uses his newly awakened faculties, by a hearty laugh of pleasure.

Another, who, when first received, made day and night hideous by shrieks like those of a hyena, and, in all respects, was more like a brute than like a human being, now sits quietly and in silence, and has exchanged those horrid sounds for a few words, which it evidently gives him great satisfaction to utter.

The boy, Sylvanus Walker, who, two years ago, had not learnt even to use any of his limbs, sits, stands up, shakes hands, is pleased, and smiles, asks you how you do, and reads readily any part of a little book which was first put into his hands less than three months ago, points out any word you ask for on the page, and does all this with so much pleasure, that, when you are about to turn away from him, he asks to be allowed to read more, and eagerly reads to you his favorite passages. Like other children, he is sometimes wayward and refuses to read, but the brutish, animal will is gradually yielding to kindness and affection.

George ——, who knew nothing, could do nothing, observed not the first rules of decency, and was utterly helpless, and who, doubtless, under the usual system of neglect, would always have remained so, or, as is universally the case with neglected idiots, would have become, if possible, worse, takes the visitor's hand, talks, articulating distinctly, and goes to the letter-frame, upon the table, and not only selects and arranges the letters to spell any common short word, but, without aid, selects and arranges the letters and forms the sentence, *Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name*; — divine words, which are now familiar to the eye, and which, if he continues to make the same progress, will soon, we may hope, reach the soul of the poor, rescued child. This boy was lately allowed to make a short visit to his parents; and when, at the expiration of the time, his teacher went to bring him home, the father began to thank him, and to tell him how much he was pleased with his progress. "George, now," he said, "plays with the other

boys; he plays *like* the other boys." He would have gone on, but he could only put his handkerchief to his eyes, — he could say no more.

The progress which these poor boys have made in two years is fully equal, taken altogether, to that which the same number of intelligent children would have made in the same time. It seems, indeed, vastly greater. They have been changed from motionless, stupid, speechless idiots, into walking, speaking, thinking beings. They have laid aside the brute and become human. They have made a beginning in the career of intelligence, and henceforward ordinary care will keep them in the path onwards. Their residence in the school for this short time has been already an unmeasured, almost an infinite, blessing to them, and to their friends, and to all who will ever come in contact with them. Each one of them was, and would always have continued, a heavy burden, a filthy, hideous, and disgusting object, grievous to the eye and to the heart of his parents. Each one of them, even now, if their education is carried no further, will be a help, a pleasant companion, capable of exciting and of returning affection. Each one will be in some degree happy, and capable of giving happiness.

If we take only the lowest, the mere economical, view of the question, these children have gained, and through them the State has gained, by this beginning of an education, far more than it has cost the State to make the experiment. Every one of them would, during his life, have been, not only wholly unproductive, but a constant burden upon his friends. Almost every one of them would have needed nearly the whole care of some person entirely, or almost entirely, devoted to him. Not one of them had the proper control of his limbs, or could be of any use. Now almost every one of them is capable of taking care of himself, and of doing something useful in a family or workshop, or on a farm. The time of five persons has been devoted to these children for two years. If they had remained, uneducated, in their homes, nearly the whole time of ten persons, in so many different families, would have been given up to them as long as they lived, — for perhaps ten or twenty years.

The care of an idiot, as he is usually managed, where there is no expectation of improvement, and where no at-

tempt is made to improve him, must be the most dreary and repulsive task conceivable. Hope, which comes to all else, comes not to the attendant of an idiot. In its place are pain, anxiety, and despair. But not so in the school for idiots. The care which is methodical, which requires thought and contrivance, and is crowned with more or less success, ceases to be disgusting and repulsive. It is always pleasant to overcome difficulties, and here difficulties apparently insurmountable are overcome. It cannot but be gratifying to see the eye which has been always wandering, or fixed only on empty space, begin to come under the control of a teacher's will, and to answer to a feeling or a thought, — to see activity gradually taking the place of inaction, the will created where will has been wanting, limbs that have never obeyed the will gradually learning to obey. It must be pleasant to hear articulate sounds from lips that have never uttered any sounds but those like the cries of brute animals, — to see cleanliness, order, helpfulness, take the place of helplessness, confusion, and filth; the color of health succeeding to a deathlike paleness, and the smile of answering intelligence and affection where intelligence and affection never before spoke.

The time is not lost to the teacher. He has the satisfaction of having helped a fellow-creature to regain the lost gift of intelligence; and in doing it he will have made progress, mentally and morally, himself. That is not lost labor which requires the constant exercise of gentleness, of patience, of affection, of perseverance, of absolute self-control. If we consider to what frivolous objects a large portion of life is devoted, we cannot but feel that there are few who might not spare some time to assist in the education of idiots, and that that time would not be unprofitably spent.

Let it not be objected, that very little will come from the exertion of a vast deal of patience and attention; that, after all, the poor patient will have become, at best, only a simpleton. Think of the difference in the feeling of parents; think of the home into which is sent back a smiling, affectionate, thinking, helpful child, in place of the creature which had been an object of horror, fear, and disgust, even to a mother; think of the satisfaction of having done what could be done, — of seeing some intel-

ligence, some enjoyment, some capacity, some helpfulness, some indication of humanity, where before there were none. To the child the gain will have been boundless. A scene of enjoyment and progress, of conscious thought and intelligence, will have been substituted for the inanity of a mere animal existence. All that the child can be made to enjoy will be a clear addition to the sum of human enjoyment.

Many of the circumstances under which the experiment at South Boston has been made were very unfavorable. To all the teachers and assistants the work was entirely new. The superintendent, who had some experience, and, as these Reports prove, great knowledge of the subject, was obliged by ill health to be a long time absent. The pupils were taken from the very poorest and most wretched families, where their condition was far lower than it would have been in families in easy circumstances;—for every case of idiocy is more hopeless in proportion as it has been more neglected. Of the thirteen children early taken into the school, eight were over nine years of age; and all writers (there are not many) upon the subject of the education of idiots agree that the longer the treatment of idiocy is deferred, the fainter is the prospect of success.

Nearly all those selected for the school were of the lowest and most hopeless type, and so ill were they selected, that classification amongst them was nearly impossible. Thus the teacher was always acting at a disadvantage. If, acquainted by some previous practice with the work he was undertaking, he could have selected quite young pupils, of nearly the same age, and of a promising condition of body, the effect produced would doubtless have been far more striking.

Yet we have some doubt whether we ought to regret that the circumstances have been in so many ways unpropitious. If, with subjects nearly the worst that could be found, from the most wretched classes, with little previous knowledge of the forms and developments of idiocy, and no experience as to the kind of treatment best suited to different cases, and with all external circumstances unfavorable, the teacher has been able to produce such absolutely wonderful changes, what might he not have done if all things had been auspicious?

What may he not accomplish hereafter, if, with matured experience, capable and efficient assistants, and external circumstances favorable, he has the means furnished him of continuing the experiment? It is no longer an experiment. This is success. The question of the possibility of improving the condition of the most hopeless idiot is answered. If, under circumstances so unfavorable, in so short a space as two years, such changes as we have seen can be wrought in cases so desperate as those of which we have spoken, and of which we have *seen* the evidence, there is henceforth no place for despair in the worst cases that can occur.

The question of the continuance of the school is a most grave and important one.

There are in the State probably not less than eighteen or nineteen hundred idiotic persons. "By diligent and careful inquiries in nearly one hundred towns, in different parts of the State," the Commissioners "ascertained the existence and examined the condition of five hundred and seventy-four" persons in a state of hopeless idiocy. These were in 77 towns. Only 63 towns, containing an aggregate population of 185,942, were thoroughly examined. In these were found 361 idiots, besides insane persons. If the other parts of the State have the same proportion, the number of idiots in the Commonwealth, according to the census of 1850, must be nearly 1,900. There must be as many as one idiot in every 519, or perhaps 515, persons in the Commonwealth.

Conceive of the amount of suffering to the parents. Estimate the loss to the State from having so many persons, not only unproductive consumers, but consuming all the time and care of at least 900 other persons. Think of the infinite loss to humanity of 1,900 persons condemned to a condition often not more desirable than that of a brute animal.

If a public institution is maintained, many of these will be saved. Multitudes who have now no one to care for them will be taken care of. Whatever is done in a public institution will become known, and the effect will expand itself beneficially everywhere. There are now few who hope, and there are none who know how to care for idiocy. When the means, the course, and the efficacy of sanative measures are known, all will begin to

hope, many will find out what to do, and when and how to do it, and much private instruction will be given.

It is desirable that so great a good should be done publicly, for the sake of the great economy which may be used in the instruction of numbers. The time required for one will suffice for several.

The good will show itself, and go out to other States. Another instance will be added to the number of those in which Massachusetts has taken the first steps in the onward progress of mankind.

The whole subject of the education of idiots is so absolutely new in the history of humanity, and especially to general readers, scarcely any notice of what has been done having found its way into any but medical periodicals, — it has, moreover, so important a bearing upon the improvement of many of the processes of physical and mental education, even in the most highly endowed children, and it is treated with so much ability in these Reports, — that we shall make no apology for quoting somewhat largely the exposition of the principles on which the school now in operation has been and is to be conducted.

“The first and most important object aimed at, during the year, has been the improvement of the bodily condition of the scholars by physical TRAINING, that is, by regular and systematic exercises, for invigorating the body generally; for increasing the muscular strength and activity; for giving more ready and perfect command over all the motions of the body and limbs; and for quickening all the senses.

“Whatever system is adopted for the instruction of idiots, the foundation of it must be laid in physical education, that is, thorough bodily training. When a common boy first comes under the teacher's care, this training has generally been accomplished; his body has been broken in, as it were, to the service of his will; he has learned, in the games and sports of childhood, and in various ways, to have prompt and entire command of all his muscles. It is not so with the idiot.

“The first thing, then, was to invigorate their bodies, and to give them more complete command over all the muscles. This has been done by diet, by bathing, by walking and running in the open air, and by various gymnastic exercises, such as standing erect, raising first one foot, then the other, one arm, and then the other; by marching; by climbing on ladders; by swinging dumb-bells; by holding out objects at arm's length; by tossing and catching balls; and by various movements of the body and

limbs, at the word of command. This has been followed up with such variations as occurred to the teacher, in order to prevent monotony; — and with the most marked effect. . . . A manifest improvement has taken place, not only in the health and appearance of the boys, but in their capacity for taking care of themselves.

“ But this is not all, by any means. Bodily training is an important agent in the development of the mental and moral powers, though it seems only to promote muscular strength and manual dexterity. When a child is learning to balance himself on his feet, he is doing something for his mind as well as for his body; he is training his mental faculties, as well as his muscular fibres; and when he first toddles from the supporting corner to his mother’s arms, he brings into play enterprise and courage, as well as arms and legs. And so it is through childhood, boyhood, and youth. Every new effort, every new triumph over difficulties, every new game, every new undertaking, be it ever so simple, which gives dexterity and hardihood of body, gives also quickness and vigor of mind. The marble, the top, and the hoop; the sledge, the skates, and the ball; the boat, the gun, and the horse, may, each and all of them, be of priceless value to the mind. Exercises with them need not be mere idle sports and useless pastimes; they are, when well timed, better both for body and mind, than ill-timed tasks and lessons.

“ The idiotic child seldom shows a taste for any toys, except the very simplest; — sometimes not even for these. What little taste, however, he may have, should be cultivated. If he leaves the rattle, and comes to blow a tin whistle, or drag a wooden horse, it is a sign of *progress*; he must be encouraged in it; and his teacher must not lose hope if he creeps when he would have him run. The poor boy must ever be *behind* ordinary boys. Before he can trundle a hoop, a bright lad may learn to drive a locomotive engine; before he can fly a kite, the other may learn to soar in a balloon; before he can cross a pond upon skates, the other may be exploring the arctic regions. But this very helplessness should appeal to our hearts; and because the poor creature, shorn of the wings of intellect, and crippled in all his faculties, is lagging far behind in the general race of progress, we should lend him a helping hand, lest he be entirely lost.” — *Report of 1850*, pp. 44 – 46.

“ Bodily training, as has been already said, must not only be the first, but almost the last, step in the course of instruction of some idiots. Important as it is in the education of all youth, it is especially so to all of this class. It not only invigorates the general health, and induces sound sleep, thereby indirectly promoting mental vigor, but it has, moreover, an immediate and direct

influence in calling out the *attention*, and giving command of it. This is a very important matter, and requires particular notice.

“One of the greatest difficulties in teaching idiots arises from their listlessness, and their dislike to any mental effort. They are, or seem to be, unable to give continued attention to impressions made by external objects. . . . The idiot of the lowest kind gives but little attention to the impressions upon his senses; eyes has he, but he sees not; ears has he, but he hears not. Even hunger calls not his taste into action; he cares not for flavors or savors,—he only wants to fill up an aching void,—no matter whether it be with cannily cooked dishes, or crude garbage.

“To mental impressions he is, of course, less attentive than to sensuous ones. So unused is he to any mental effort, that he not only dislikes to think, but he really seems uneasy and pained when he is compelled to think. If his attention is forcibly aroused, it flags again in a moment. . . . His teacher has the greatest difficulty to keep his eye fixed upon his own. It *sidles* off continually, and drops downward. He must be spoken to loudly and earnestly. Visible objects must be presented continually, to illustrate the subject of the lesson. They must be of bright colors and striking forms; they must be presented in various positions, and his attention must be drawn to them by earnest speech and fervid gesticulation. When, by these means, his listlessness has been overcome, and he begins to give attention more readily, and to keep it up longer, he has really gained a great deal. . . . Many of the exercises of our school, though repeated again and again, may seem to give nothing more than a little increase of manual dexterity; a little more ready command of some of the muscles of the body. The principle, however, is this, and it is an important one:—that *every movement of the muscles requires the exercise of the will, and of the attention*, and by this exercise some of the mental powers are really strengthened, and their activity promoted. It matters not much by what particular kind of exercises this effect upon the will and upon attention is gained.

“This principle has been steadily kept in view during the first year's training of our boys, and its good effects are already demonstrated. The constant call upon volition and attention in gymnastic exercises has not only given more tone and vigor to the system, more strength and dexterity of body, but more ready command of *attention*, and therefore more real mental power.”—*Ibid.*, pp. 48–50.

“The attempts to convey DIRECT INSTRUCTION have been confined principally to giving lessons upon objects which address themselves immediately to the *senses*. In all the exercises for

training the senses, some real knowledge of the qualities of the objects must of course be gained, but the conveyance of knowledge in those exercises has been secondary to the improvement of the senses themselves.

“The untutored idiot gives so little attention to the appearance of things, that often he does not even distinguish bright colors, unless his attention is directed to them. Large pieces of bright-colored pasteboard or paper are placed before him, and he is required to distinguish between red and black, and blue and green, and the like. At the same time, the names of the colors are given, and he is required to learn and to repeat them. In this, of course, the disposition to imitation must be relied upon, because the scholar does not understand the words. . . . Considerable time must be spent upon exercises in naming objects, and the idiot must be made to repeat the name, perhaps, many hundred times; for these simple elements of knowledge, which other children learn merely by the sportive exercise of their senses, can be mastered by him only with patient and oft-repeated efforts.

“It will serve to give an idea of the tediousness of the process, to state that Mr. Richards was obliged to make a boy of thirteen years of age repeat three consecutive words six hundred and forty times, before he could be sure he would do it correctly. The same process has to be gone through with in order to teach them other qualities of objects. Balls made of different materials, of wood, woollen, leather, India-rubber, &c., are placed upon the table before them, and they are drilled upon their names and qualities. The same is done with regard to objects of different size and shape. Step by step, and slowly, often turning back, and going over the inch of ground he has gained, the idiot creeps forward a little. It may cost him a score of lessons to learn to distinguish between the length of a foot rule and of a yard-stick, but when he does, he has gained some positive and directly useful knowledge.

“Different kinds of grain are kept in boxes, and measures of different capacities are at hand. The same may be done with a great variety of substances; fruits, spices, &c., &c. Having learned to know the difference between one and two, between a handful and a pint, a pint and a quart, the idiot is made to pour two successive pint measures into a quart measure, and then his feeble intellect is taxed to comprehend that two pints make a quart. This is no light task for his untrained mind. Hour after hour, and day after day, he must fill a quart measure, pronounce its name, and the name of the grain, empty it into a larger measure, and count the number of times he does it, in order to fill a peck. It is very hard to teach him that one and one make two;

harder still, that two and two make four. Without the aid of *objects*, of the things themselves, he would never comprehend the relative quantities composing pints and quarts, quarts and pecks, pecks and bushels. With their aid even, his ideas of their relations may be vague and indefinite, but perhaps not more so than many a boy who knows Latin and Greek enough to enter a college, but who never had the relations between measures demonstrated to his senses; and is perplexed to remember whether it is four pecks and eight gallons, or eight pecks and four gallons, that go to make a bushel." — *Ibid.*, pp. 59 - 61.

"It is not deemed necessary to go into a detail of all the modes of instructing the pupils in our school, because these particular modes are unimportant. Enough has been said to illustrate the principle. With this principle in his mind, each teacher will find ways and means to carry it out. To each of the pupils' senses the appropriate objects are to be presented in the concrete, and their names, numbers, and qualities are to be taught. To the eye are to be presented colors, forms, positions, motions, and measures; to the ear, sounds, in all their varieties of concord and discord, of time and tune; to the feeling, sizes, resistance, smoothness, roughness, elasticity, and weight; — to each sense, its appropriate objects, varied in as many ways as possible, and made as different from each other, and as striking, in appearance, as can be.

"After the senses are trained to take note of their appropriate objects, the various perceptive faculties are to be trained by exercises adapted to each of them. The greatest possible number and variety of facts are to be gathered by the exercises of these faculties, — and to be garnered up in the memory, — as a store, out of which the higher mental faculties may draw materials for constructing general ideas.

"The efforts made to teach reading have been, upon the whole, satisfactory. Some even of the lowest class have learned to select words, printed on slips of paper. The ordinary method of teaching the letters first was tried, but failed; that of teaching each word, as a whole, that is, as a complex sign of a thing, was more successful. For example, the different powers of the three letters *h*, *a*, *t*, could not be understood; but the complex sign made by uniting the three, and making the word *hat*, could be understood as the sign of the thing worn upon the head. It was the same with Laura Bridgman. The success in these cases shows how well this mode of teaching reading is adapted to the simple understanding of children.

"Besides imparting mere knowledge, there is a still higher duty to these unhappy beings, which is to bring out, and to train, as far as may be done, the feeble germs of their social affections,

and their moral sense, their love to men, and their responsibility to God. As this is the highest, it is also the hardest task of all; for, as the peculiarly human attributes upon which all virtue is founded are last in the order of development in the progress of the race, so they are feeblest in those whose low organization throws them back nearer to the original animal condition. We must profit, however, by the great lesson of patience set us by Nature in her slow development of the race, where the long day of a thousand years is followed by the morrow of a thousand, in which a small but certain progress is clearly shown. How long men remained in the animal condition we know not; we first find them in the state of unthinking pagans; slowly they become reasoning heathens; and at last, believing Christians, in which state they linger long before they manifest their sense of being truly children of God, by loving all their brethren, and thus obeying the will of their Heavenly Father.

“If, then, those who, in advance of the rest of the race, have arrived at what they call Christianity, are still selfish, and ready to fight for their own selfish ends, how shall we expect the poor idiot, who has not even arrived at the point of development at which other men become pagans, — who has never felt enough of the blind spirit of veneration to make him bow down and worship an idol, — how shall we expect him to manifest the true sense of duty to God, by love to men? The task is hard indeed, but not hopeless; and what we sometimes see in little children should greatly encourage us.

“Little children do indeed continually manifest the germs of noble sentiments and generous affections, as well as of the intellectual powers; — but how differently are they treated! For the germs of the intellect there is early culture, and skilful training. The best talent of the civilized world has been brought to bear, for generations, upon the subject of its development. From the infant school, up to the university, almost all the incentives, all the prizes, all the honors, are for mere intellectual excellence. Talent! talent! that is the one thing needful! States found and support, and rich men endow, establishments for all sorts of intellectual culture; which is all as it should be; but where are the systematic means for the culture of practical love and goodness?

“Let the wisdom and the power of man be devoted to finding out and putting into operation ways and means for making children virtuous and good, as they have been for making them merely wise, and the result will be equally great.

“Much as the idiot needs physical training and intellectual instruction, he needs moral training and elevation equally. It has been said before, but it cannot be repeated too often, that his appetites and propensities, being never restrained by any intellect,

or any moral sense, seem to monopolize for themselves all those energies of the system, which, in other persons, are expended in part through the action of moral and social affections; hence those appetites and propensities increase by what they feed upon; they grow with his growth, and strengthen with his strength. He has no idea of the capacity of his stomach, and therefore he gorges it; he has no idea of property, and therefore he steals; he has no idea of delicacy, and therefore he continually offends that of others; he has no idea of affection, and therefore he does not love; he has no idea of moral and social relations, and therefore he fulfils none of them. All this is true of the uninstructed idiot; but, even though he has none of these ideas *developed*, he has, nevertheless, the latent *capacity* for their development, and it is upon this capacity that our expectations of his moral culture and elevation must be founded.

“The idiot has within him the germs of the moral virtues and social affections, but they are like seeds lying in a wintry soil; they will never sprout, if left to themselves; we must warm them into life, by subjecting them to genial influences; we must quicken their growth, by surrounding them with objects of affection, and by giving to them the daily influence of the sunshine of love. Under these influences there will be growth; tardy and slow indeed, but still growth. The idiot will learn what love is, though he may not know the word that expresses it; he will feel kindly affections, though he cannot understand the simplest virtuous principle; and he may begin to live acceptably to God, before he has learned the name by which men call Him.

“There may thus be training to the exercise of the affections, long before any instruction can be given in their nature; and to virtue, long before its precepts can be understood; indeed, without this training, the precepts are apt to be like seed sown upon stony ground.

“As has been said before, the idiot of the lowest class is but an animal, yet, when the cries of the animal nature are hushed, and the talisman of love is presented, then the long dormant affection will manifest itself; as in the cold and senseless iron a sort of answering life appears when the magnet is brought near to it.

“In our pupils, even of the lowest class, it is easy to discover the faint manifestation of the affections; as in the case of the one who can neither speak, nor walk, nor creep, nor even chew, but who manifests the pleasure he feels when any one in woman's apparel approaches him; — it brings back the memory of a mother's love. He shows as plainly as looks and motions can show, that he loves the matron; his eye glows with a kindly warmth, and his idiotic look is lost for a moment, in the gleam of affection which lightens his countenance. He understands not

speech ; but he understands the natural language of kindness, and strives to answer to it.

“As to the higher moral nature,—the sense of right and wrong,—the supremacy of conscience, and the feeling of accountability to God,—we look almost in vain for any rudiments of these crowning glories of humanity in the uninstructed idiot. To him the animal nature, the appetites and propensities, are given in nearly the same degree as to other men, and it is by being unrestrained and unbalanced that they become rampant ; in capacity for the social affections he is more stinted ; still more so in the intellectual powers ; and is left utterly without any moral or religious sense. He cannot therefore become, as compared with other men, an accountable moral agent. He is destined to remain through life a little child ; as such he must be regarded and treated ; his feeble powers of self-government must be strengthened ; he must be surrounded by the kindest and best influences ; he must be spared from undue temptations ;—but, after all, the responsibility for his conduct must rest with those upon whose sense of justice and mercy God has made him a helpless dependent.”—*Ibid.*, pp. 65–70.

Our object has been to give, as briefly as possible, and almost entirely by extracts from the writers who have treated of this subject, some idea of what has been done, and of what can be done, in this apparently most hopeless of all the fields of human culture. If a little of the interest to which we think the subject entitled shall be excited in our readers, we may resume it in a future number.

G. B. E.

NOTE.

THE concluding article on “The North American Review on Hungary” will appear in the next number.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Jamaica in 1850, or the Effects of Sixteen Years of Freedom on a Slave Colony. By JOHN BIGELOW. New York and London: G. P. Putnam. 1850. 12mo. pp. 214.

MANY of the arguments adduced in defence of African slavery are such as would never have been brought forward had the question concerned the enslavement of white persons. A similar remark applies to much that is urged in connection with the inquiry, What are the results of emancipation in the West Indies? The "skin not colored like our own" makes a great difference in the one case as well as in the other. Were some millions of white men in the Old World to shake off, and without bloodshed, a bondage even more terrible than that which presses down the Russian serf, the question whether they were to be congratulated on their success would hardly be decided by a simple reference to custom-house statistics, or by the results of an inquiry how far their former oppressors were pecuniarily benefited by the change. If some province of Austria, where feudal institutions still remain, were to make a successful struggle for freedom, American sympathizers would not readily grant that it had turned out a failure, because the incomes of the great landholders had suffered somewhat in the transition. Were some security for liberty and life wrung from Ferdinand of Naples by his subjects, there might be a falling off in *his* income. Perhaps we should learn, too, that even under comparative freedom the dwellers in that sultry clime, and on a soil which produces with little labor all they need, would not be half so industrious as are our laborers. Nay, further, it might be proved by figures, that, since the era of freedom, the exports of sulphur and macaroni had gradually fallen off. All this might be true, and yet we should regard the question of bondage or freedom as by no means settled by such considerations as these. There would be other inquiries to be made. How is it, we should ask, with the people who are more numerous than are those who were the former proprietors and landholders? How is it with interests other than those represented in any table of exports? Are the people better off as respects the comforts of life? Are they happier than they were under the old system? Is crime diminishing? Are school-houses and churches springing up? Allowing, of course, for delays and impediments, incident to every great change in the

economy of a country, and something also for climate, and more especially for the bad effects on energy and character of the previous years of misrule, is the great mass of the people, we should ask, making gradual yet sure progress in intelligence, morality, and the arts of life? If an affirmative answer were given to these inquiries, we should, to say the least, look upon the great experiment hopefully; and, as lovers of liberty, with earnest sympathy towards the emancipated class.

Not so, however, do most people argue in reference to the results of emancipation in the West Indies. Though all these questions admit in this case of an affirmative answer, the great question is still urged, as if on the reply to it, and on that alone, the whole argument rested, How do the advocates of emancipation account for the falling off in exports and in the value of real estate in the British West Indies?

It is to this class of inquirers that the work of Mr. Bigelow is addressed. We do not find fault with him that he does not lay somewhat more stress upon the considerations of a more general nature just referred to. His argument he probably felt would be all the more effective if directed against what are called the doubts and objections of "practical men" to the whole scheme of emancipation. We think that he has prosecuted his task with singular ability. Though not superseding the works of Edwards and Gurney on the same subject, Mr. Bigelow has the advantage of the former, inasmuch as his observations relate to Jamaica since emancipation, while his book will recommend itself to some minds as not being, like that of the latter, the work of a professed Abolitionist.

We are glad to see that he avoids the opposite errors into which most writers have fallen. He does not, in order to make out his case, gloss over the undoubted fact, that great depression has fallen upon certain branches of industry in Jamaica, and that many plantations have been abandoned or sold at greatly reduced values. Neither, on the other hand, does he keep in the background an equally important fact, that the Island previous to emancipation was far from being prosperous; it having been, indeed, on the brink of pecuniary ruin. People often speak of the present state of the British West Indies, as if *under slavery* there were no such things as heavily mortgaged estates and exhausted lands. In maintaining that *the Emancipation Act only precipitated a result which was inevitable*, our author meets a very important class of objections frequently urged against that measure.

The main causes to which he ascribes the declining condition of some of the pecuniary interests of Jamaica are, first, the degrading estimate placed upon every species of labor by the *whites*

inhabitants; second, the blighting influence of absenteeism; third, the heavy mortgages upon landed estates; and, lastly, the large size of the properties. All these points are treated with great clearness, and the whole argument is in the highest degree encouraging to those who wish well to humanity, black as well as white.

On one further point (though he is not by any means the first who has presented it), he is also very satisfactory. He meets, it seems to us, most triumphantly the plea, that the emancipated slaves will not work on the plantations, by showing that this is simply because they prefer to work on their own small properties to laboring for their masters at wages of eighteen, or, at the most, twenty-four cents a day, — they boarding themselves, — and that, too, where most articles of food are twice as dear as they are with us. What a commentary on the complaint that emancipation has worked badly, is the fact, that more than one hundred thousand former slaves have become owners by purchase of small properties, ranging from one to three acres in extent? We should not say that England was declining, if we should learn that the great estates, now owned by comparatively a handful of men, were rapidly being cut up into small portions, and that those who were once day-laborers upon them were every day becoming themselves small landholders. Nor should we be astonished if they preferred working on these to tilling the ground belonging to others. On two other causes of the existing depression, we are surprised that Mr. Bigelow does not lay more stress. It seems to have escaped his notice, that the complaint of deficiency of labor is no novel one. It dates back to 1807, the time when the slave-trade was abolished. From that period down to the year of emancipation, there has been a continual decrease in the number of black laborers; and also in the export of sugar. So that the legitimate inference from the complaints on this score is not so much that the Emancipation Act was a mistake, as that the abolition of the slave-trade was a great error. The other point to which we think he does not give sufficient prominence is the effect of the repeal of the protective duties on colonial sugar upon the production of this article. We suspect that the opinion of those most interested in the matter, the inhabitants themselves, "who," he says, "ascribe their ruin, not to the abolition of slavery, but to free trade," and who affirm, "that, if they only had the protection on the staples of the Island which they enjoyed with slavery, they would prosper," — we suspect that this opinion is entitled to much more weight than our author is willing to give to it.

To the opinion of Mr. Bigelow, under the head of "Future Destiny of Jamaica," that it will soon become a very prosperous

member of our own confederacy, we cannot assent. Even if England made no objection to the scheme of annexation, it could hardly come into our union as a slave State. It is almost equally improbable that our Southern brethren, having seen its efficiency so often, would abstain from the cry, "We 'll dissolve the Union," if it be admitted as a free State. There is nothing to indicate that Jamaica will cease to be a British colony. Great Britain has no more loyal subjects than the colored people of her emancipated Islands.

We agree, however, with our author, in thinking that the tendency of all the influences he has enumerated "is to throw the land into the possession of those who can and will cultivate it." We do not see aught in this fact to discourage the hopes of the friends of freedom. We cannot, indeed, expect that Jamaica will ever present the spectacle of a population as thrifty, as laborious, as enterprising, as that of New England. The influences of a burning sun, in these regards, will probably be felt by black, as they are by white, men in Europe and Asia, as well as in South America and the West Indies. Still, making all due allowance for this consideration, there are some circumstances which are highly favorable in the condition of the former. We can merely glance at them. Notwithstanding all that is said by the planters and others, the division of the large estates of the Island, which is everywhere going on, notwithstanding the opposition of the great landholders, is destined to have a most beneficial effect upon the character and prospects of the blacks, in giving them a feeling of independence, and in exciting their honorable ambition as owners of the soil on which they labor. It will have the further effect of turning the attention of the population towards other branches of industry than those of sugar-making and cotton-picking. Thus encouraging invention and skill, and sharpening the faculties, — in a word, improving and elevating in all respects the man, though possibly at the cost of a falling off in the exports of the two great staples of the Island under slavery.

It is also a most fortunate circumstance, that the religion of the country is Protestant. Who can doubt that one main cause of the low condition of St. Domingo, and the South American states, is the blighting influence, everywhere manifest throughout the world, of Roman Catholicism?

Whatever force these considerations may have, whether much or little, we think most of our readers will none the less be of the opinion, that it is better for all parties that Jamaica should be in the hands of the blacks, than that it should be in the hands of the whites with the others as a part of the property, to do by constraint what these white brethren will not do, namely, till and

cultivate the soil. Even if the question of attendant advantage following emancipation were more complicated than it is, even if the disorders following freedom in the West Indies were as great as those resulting in some cases in Europe from the change from oppressive to free institutions, we should still believe that in the long run, both for blacks and whites, freedom is better POLICY even, than slavery can be. There may be inconveniences under freedom, but slavery has these as well. The thought of the future of freedom may suggest some anxieties, but they are not so great as those which lower over the future of slavery, whether it exist in an island in the Caribbean Sea, or in one of our own United States.

In taking leave of our subject, we would express the hope that no difference of opinion of ours in respect to minor points will lead our readers to suppose that we would detract in any degree from what we deem the great merit of the book we have examined. It is the work of one who, having had apparently rare opportunities for observation, has used them with a degree of impartiality which is also somewhat rare. We know of no one who, on the whole, we think, could have produced a book on this subject better adapted to invite the confidence of the reader, as regards the general accuracy of its statements and views, and to repay perusal.

The Civil Law in its Natural Order. By JEAN DOMAT. Translated from the French, by WILLIAM STRAHAN, LL. D., Advocate in Doctors' Commons. Edited from the Second London Edition, by LUTHER S. CUSHING. In two volumes. Boston: Charles C. Little & James Brown. 1850. Royal 8vo. pp. 978, 790.

THE author of this work, Jean Domat, was a man distinguished not only for the depth and variety of his professional attainments, but for his pure life and upright conduct. That he was honored with the friendship and confidence of the illustrious Pascal is in itself no small commendation. He was also much connected with the members of the Port Royal Society, and always ready to aid them with what they doubtless often required, the advice of a practical and sagacious man of affairs.

His great work, the Civil Law in its Natural Order, was the fruit of a long life of assiduous devotion to legal studies. Although it is moderate in bulk, compared with the voluminous treatises of many other jurists, its brevity and condensation are in themselves proofs of the patience and care with which it was prepared. It is a work unlike those legal text-books which

English and American lawyers are in the habit of consulting. These last are, as a general rule, merely practical summaries of the law, often prepared in a careless and slovenly manner, and little more than a digest of reported cases. Their object is merely to furnish the bar and the bench with a rule for the decision of litigated cases, and considerations of form, symmetry, and proportion are quite discarded. The object of Domat, on the contrary, was to give the essence and spirit of that great monument of human wisdom, the Roman law, and to present such of its principles as were of general interest and universal application, disembarassed from all technicalities, and in their natural and scientific order. He commences his work with a chapter on the first principles of all laws, which he contends were unknown to the pagans. He then proceeds to what he calls the two great laws of man, which are those laid down by the Saviour in the twenty-second chapter of Matthew, verses 37, 38, 39, comprising love to God and love to man. From these he deduces the various relations of man in civil society, the duties which arise from those relations, and the manner in which they are expounded and enforced in the Roman law.

This work was published at the close of the seventeenth century, and has ever since maintained its ground as a legal classic. This position is due to its great learning, its luminous arrangement, its philosophical method, and its enlightened spirit. Wherever the Roman law is in force, it has been studied as we study Blackstone. It was translated into English by Dr. Strahan, in 1733. The present edition is that translation, which has been compared with the latest edition of the original, and many errors corrected. An index has been furnished (prepared by Mr. Henry Ware), and material aid has been given to the student in search of the original authorities by an alphabetical list of all the rubrics of the several titles of the Institutes, Digest, and Code, subjoined in an appendix to the second volume. The name of Mr. Cushing is a sufficient assurance that any editorial labor which he has undertaken to do has been well done.

The work is beautifully executed, in a convenient form, and offered at a moderate price. As the Roman law is still in force in Canada, in Louisiana, in Texas, in California, and in the new Territories of the United States, and as our own courts are always inclined to pay an enlightened respect to the eternal principles of justice which are therein embodied, we hope that the publishers will find no cause to regret their liberal enterprise, but that they will be encouraged to publish other standard works in the civil law.

A Biblical Trinity. By THEOPHILUS. Hartford, Conn.: Edwin Hunt, 6 Asylum Street. 1850. pp. xxxvii., 332.

THIS is a bold, independent, strongly-written work, demolishing with remarkable force the common views of the Trinity, and insisting on giving up the *theories* which have been embodied in creeds for the *facts* which are taught in the Scriptures. It is written evidently by one educated under Orthodox influences, and still connected with Orthodox associates. He is familiar with the whole history of his subject, and especially with the views and reasonings of Orthodox men belonging to the present generation. The book is clear in style, energetic in thought, and, while it indicates little respect for human speculations, is marked by a profound reverence for the sacred writings. The particular view of the Trinity which it maintains is, that there is one Supreme God, who, under whatever forms he may manifest himself, or through whatever agencies he may act, is still the same unchangeable Jehovah, and that, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he is "revealed to man in different capacities and relations for the work of redemption," that he is "all-sufficient for every work needful and proper to be done, whether a work actually performed by his own direct and gracious agency, or by his Son, or by any created beings whom he sees fit to employ in carrying on and carrying out the purposes of his grace. This God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is that Divine Being who performs all Divine works whatsoever. It is *He* who 'dwelleth' in the Son, and who 'doeth the work' by or through him: 'for there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus'; and 'there is none other God but one.' This is the God of the Bible,—*the Godhead as revealed to man.*"

We welcome the book as a vigorous and sincere effort made in the right direction,—the effort of a strong mind to shake off the bondage of human creeds, and attain to the liberty with which Christ would make us free. Its reasoning is peculiarly adapted to those who have been brought up in the Orthodox faith, and must do something to bring them back to a more direct allegiance to the Scriptures without the intervention of human authorities. It may also be read with advantage by any who are interested in the subject, and who have a taste for theological discussion when carried on with ability, and with a remarkable freedom from unfairness or bad temper.

Rickard Edney and the Governor's Family. A Rus-Urban Tale, Simple and Popular, yet Cultured and Noble, of Morals,

Sentiments, and Life, practically treated, and pleasantly illustrated. Containing, also; Hints on Being Good, and Doing Good. By the Author of "Margaret," and "Philo," "Margaret, a Tale of the Real and the Ideal," and "Philo, an Evangeliad." Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1850.

We should place this tale among the very first of the class to which it belongs. It is evidently a labor of love on the part of its author, if it be a labor at all, and not rather the jubilant outpouring of a soul full of activity and of genial sympathies and affections. It is written in strong, idiomatic English, by one affluent enough in language to use precisely the words he wants, and to reject those which he does not want. The style, like the sentiment of the book, is flexible and free; possibly some readers may think its freedom is that which comes from an excess of health and animal spirits. It adapts itself everywhere to the subject, deepening with the interest of the story, adequate to the expression of the strongest and most passionate thoughts, and, what is a severer test of skill in writing, neither stilted nor halting in the unexciting portions of the narrative. There are passages, in all not taking up more than a dozen pages, which remind us of the patches with which the beauties in Queen Anne's times sought to adorn themselves. They are not needed; there is variety enough without them; the satire they would convey is obscure, clumsy, out of place; and they might be removed without leaving so much as a scratch on a single feature of the tale. A literary work, not less than a painting, has its lights and shadows. Here they are adjusted with perfect freedom and naturalness, but with admirable effect, while the toning of the whole, notwithstanding the diversified and almost incongruous incidents and characters included in it, is made to harmonize all the parts, and to throw over them a warm and cheerful religious glow.

In the description of natural objects, as any one who reads the first three pages may see, there is a power almost unsurpassed; yet the descriptions are never permitted to clog the narrative, or in critical places to make us wish them out of the way. The snow-storm, the June freshet, Winkle — for is not he a natural object? — and the road he travelled over, are not gratuitous accessories brought in, but active and essential agents, carrying us on with the story, and in our recollections blending themselves with its incidents, from which they cannot be separated. So, the philanthropical measures that are discussed, always in a genial mood and often wisely, instead of interfering with or retarding the action of the piece, help it on and add new elements of interest to it. With the exception of one chapter, and possibly half a dozen paragraphs besides, the different portions grow

out of a common life, and are vital members of one living organic structure.

As a truthful and original sketch of a state of society existing nowhere but in this country, as a tale of rich and varied interest, in freshness and spontaneity of thought, in kindness and purity of spirit, in the healthfulness which pervades every part, the most pathetic and distressing not less than the most lively, in the strong and catholic religious feeling which melts away the narrowness of bigotry and unites true souls in common duties and a common worship, we know of no American tale that equals it. It leads us through scenes of wickedness, but is filled with that hopeful Christian faith, which spreads a sort of illumination round the ghastliness of vice, setting it off in its true character, and giving us power over it. It shows us distress and sorrow, but at the same time brings us into sympathy with a spirit which subdues and overcomes them. It takes us into a world, just such as we have around us, where there are snares for the innocent, where there are great wrongs and little jealousies, evil passions and habits rather than bad institutions; and it would show us how, through a cheerful faith in God and man, we may do something to diminish the mass of sin and wretchedness, and create spiritual life in the midst of what seems like moral death. It introduces us to happy homes, where natural affection and personal charms, refined and elevated by moral and religious culture, shine in all their loveliness, and diffuse around them the gentle graces, the healthful virtues, the joyful hopes, which are the crown of rejoicing in a Christian family. It brings before us the noisy, impulsive gladness of little children, and the serene joy which spreads itself as a light from heaven around the great and final sacrifice of a disinterested love. All this it does; and in hearty good-will, not without a sense of gratitude, we repeat the author's parting words, and say, "God bless thee, little book, and anoint thee for thy work, and make thee a savor of good to many."

5-14 *E. G. 211*

Montaigne: The Endless Study. And other Miscellanies. By ALEXANDER VINET. Translated, with an Introduction and Notes, by ROBERT TURNBULL. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1850. 12mo. pp. 430.

WE have read large portions of this volume with much satisfaction. Vinet, who died between three and four years ago, just before he had reached the age of fifty, was one of the most distinguished and beloved of the Swiss Protestant ministers. He was a Calvinist, and we occasionally meet in his writings with some

of the baldest and most offensive expressions of that unscriptural system, as in the following sentence : — “ At the intercession of his Son, his [God’s] wrath was turned away from you, to fall on that Son himself.” Bating such astounding doctrinal conceits, whose hideousness no elegance of diction can relieve, Vinet has many beauties of style, and many noble characteristics as a man of thought and as an advocate of lofty truths. He aimed, like John Foster, to win and impress cultivated minds. An earnest spirituality, a profound sincerity, and a mild and affectionate heart, are displayed in his writings. Dr. Turnbull has made a judicious selection. His introductory sketch is valuable. His frequent notes, excepting again their defence or palliation of Calvinism, are not irrelevant, and his translation is vigorous and elegant. It is a volume which young theologians may profitably study.

6

The Foot-Prints of the Creator : or the Asterolepis of Stromness.

By HUGH MILLER, Author of “The Old Red Sandstone,” &c. From the Third London Edition. *With a Memoir of the Author*, by LOUIS AGASSIZ. Boston : Gould, Kendall, & Lincoln. 1850. 12mo. pp. 337.

HERE is a book of pure science which the devout may read without feeling that they are perusing a plea for atheism. The writer follows hard on the track of the author of the “Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation,” exposes his ingenious but sophistical theory, and traces out, with the skill of a keen observer and a wise reasoner, the foot-prints of an Almighty Agent. The humble origin of Mr. Miller, and his early handicraft as a stone-cutter, with his strong natural acuteness of mind and his devout spirit, qualified him to write on his fortunate theme as but few men can. His volume is one which can be understood by those who are not professed geologists, and will be highly valued beyond the circle of those distinguished men who have given it their praise, a circle embracing Baron Humboldt, Sir David Brewster, and Professor Agassiz.

Alton Locke, Tailor and Poet. An Autobiography. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1850. 12mo. pp. 371.

THE violent and ungenerous review of this volume in the last number of Blackwood’s Magazine may deter some readers from its perusal, who certainly would not begrudge the time which would be occupied in scanning its intensely interesting pages.

It is said to have been written by an English clergyman. With something of the style and spirit of "Jane Eyre," it is a most harrowing, yet, we believe, unexaggerated narrative of the bitter agonies which distract the lot of poverty in England among the classes composing the Chartists. Real genius, an intense power of sympathy, and — it must necessarily have been — an intimacy with the woes which the book describes, are the evident qualifications of the writer.

Orations and Speeches. By CHARLES SUMNER. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1850. 2 vols. 16mo. pp. 410, 482.

WE suppose that most of our readers have already enjoyed the perusal of one or more of the literary addresses contained in these volumes. Of Mr. Sumner's rich scholarship, affluent diction, and generous aims, there can be but one opinion in this community. His gifts as an orator and his splendid attainments have found many appreciating audiences. It is not the fit season as yet for a criticism of his general qualities of mind, or of the position which he has assumed in the ardent strifes of philanthropy and politics of our day. We hope that some great work worthy of his talents will engage his time and fix his fame. The two volumes before us embrace twenty-five compositions.

Report of the Case of Professor John W. Webster, M. D., indicted for the Murder of George Parkman, M. D., before the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. By GEORGE BEMIS, Esq., one of the Counsel in the Case. Boston: Little & Brown. 1850. 8vo. pp. 628.

A SAD book indeed is this for the shelf of any library, but all who wish to preserve any record of that distressing history which it records must of course choose this laborious and thorough volume. Mr. Bemis, the associate with the Commonwealth's Attorney in the prosecution of the case, had every facility for the work which he has undertaken. He has exhibited the greatest diligence, care, and impartiality in procuring the most authentic and complete materials; he has spared no pains in verifying all the documents, and the voluminous contents of his report embrace some papers of great interest which have never before appeared in print. So elaborate are the composition, the illustrations, and the official guarantees of this report, that foreigners can derive from it as clear an idea of the whole case as is possessed by those who reside in this vicinity.

The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge for the Year 1851. Boston: Little & Brown. 12mo. pp. 352.

THIS is without exception the cheapest copyright book which is furnished for us, when we consider the amount of valuable information which is crowded into it, and the expense and pains at which its contents are accumulated. Its first part is purely scientific, containing, besides the calendar to which we all have to refer for one or another daily purpose, a complete astronomical exhibition of the celestial aspects for the year. The second part, which includes five sevenths of the volume, presents a full statement of the political, commercial, naval, military, judicial, financial, and civil affairs of the general government of the United States, many of the same public statistics of each of the States, with much valuable information concerning foreign countries, and an American obituary record. This is the twenty-second volume of the American Almanac. Each succeeding year makes the whole series more valuable, while the volume for each passing year becomes an indispensable article of use in the public office, the counting-room, the school, and the private dwelling. Every American who travels abroad should provide himself with this volume next to his Bible.

The District School as it was. By one who went to it. Revised Edition. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1850. 16mo. pp. 206.

THIS charming little book, which we first read seventeen years ago with great delight, deserved a reprint long before this period of its reappearance. It is one of those almost spontaneous productions of the memory and the heart which are sure to be faithful to their themes, and to express the genius of their writers. A New England district school, a few years ago, was an affair *sui generis*, and this description is a classic on its subject. It is a capital book for reading aloud, and we apprehend that the dull-est scholars will be engaged by its perusal.

The Life of John Randolph of Roanoke. By HUGH A. GARLAND. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1850. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 311, 375.

THE subject of this memoir is known to the present generation
VOL. L.—4TH S. VOL. XV. NO. I. 13

chiefly by the report of his eccentricities. As his character was passing into history chiefly under such a portraiture, it was time that a friendly, though impartial, hand should do justice to his kind and generous traits, and to his sterling qualities as a man. This Mr. Garland has done, as far as we can judge, faithfully. He has certainly given us a most entertaining biography, and withal an instructive one, interesting throughout, and amply illustrating and illustrated by much contemporary history, both of a public and a private nature.

13

American Education, its Principles and Elements. Dedicated to the Teachers of the United States. By EDWARD D. MANSFIELD, Author of the "Political Grammar," &c. New York : A. S. Barnes & Co. 1851. 12mo. pp. 330.

THIS book, which in mechanical execution is an elegant specimen of art, aims to present the principles which ought to characterize education in our country. That Christianity and republicanism should lie at the basis, and that philosophy, utility, and common sense should be the directing influences, are the leading positions of the writer, in which he is safe and wise. These great principles are in the main judiciously illustrated. The author on occasion announces his Orthodoxy. His profession as a teacher should guard him against such a liberty with the English language as he takes in coining the verb *will energize* (page 287). The volume treats, in a very intelligible and earnest way, of the Ideas of a Republic, and of an American Education ; of the Means of perpetuating Civil and Religious Liberty ; of the Qualifications, Character, and Method of a Teacher ; of Science, Mathematics, Astronomy, History, Language, Literature, and Conversation ; of the Constitution ; of the Bible ; and of the Education of Women.

14

Religious Progress : Discourses on the Development of the Christian Character. By WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS. Boston : Gould, Kendall, & Lincoln. 1850. 12mo. pp. 258.

HERE are nine Discourses on so many words of that pregnant text from the Apostle Peter, 2d Epistle, i. 5, 6, 7. The leading thoughts which connect them together are expressed with power and unction, and are happily harmonized into a consistent view of the great elements of the Christian character. Occasionally a little ambitious rhetoric, or a strain of dogma not accordant with the simplicity that is in Christ, will meet the eye or fall upon the

ear ; but the volume is one of unusual vigor and loftiness of thought, and recognizes on every page the working of influences which at present do most agitate the Christian world.

15

—————

The Dangers and Duties of the Mercantile Profession. An Address delivered before the Mercantile Library Association, at its Thirtieth Anniversary, Nov. 13, 1850. By GEORGE S. HILLARD. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields, 1850. 12mo. pp. 47.

THE Association before which this address was delivered is one eminently entitled to the support and confidence of our community. It was first organized in March, 1820, by a small number of young men engaged in mercantile employments, for the purpose of forming a library and adopting other means of self-culture. From the first its numbers and usefulness have gradually, but steadily, increased, until in 1845 its pecuniary resources had become so enlarged, through the wise generosity of the Boston merchants, that it was deemed advisable to obtain an act of incorporation from the State Legislature, in order to give greater security and permanence to its existence. It now comprises more than seventeen hundred members, with a library of nearly eight thousand volumes, including many valuable works which are not easily accessible elsewhere in this country, and funded property amounting to nearly twenty thousand dollars. Among the agencies which the Association employs for carrying out its objects are a reading-room, a course of weekly lectures upon general topics, during the winter season, by gentlemen from various parts of the country, and weekly literary exercises by its own members. Such is the Mercantile Library Association ; and when we consider how great and important is the influence exerted in public affairs by the mercantile body, we cannot but feel a deep interest in its welfare. The merchants of Boston have always borne an unblemished reputation, and have ever been characterized by sound, judicious, and conservative principles. It is for the young men who are now crowding upon the stage of action to uphold that reputation and cherish those principles. This they will best do by a faithful use of all the means for intellectual and moral improvement which such an institution affords.

Of Mr. Hillard's Address we need say but little. It is alike admirable in conception and in execution, and bears all the marks of that large and ripe scholarship which we are accustomed to expect from his graceful pen. Bringing to his subject a thorough acquaintance with the masterpieces of Grecian and Roman eloquence and the golden treasures of English literature, and with a

mind enriched by foreign travel, he also exhibits a keen perception of both the advantages and disadvantages of the profession to which his hearers had dedicated the energy of youth and the experience of maturer years. After some prefatory remarks on the difference between men of action and men of thought, as illustrated by the people of England and of Germany, he proceeds to compare the relative advantages of the young student at college and of the clerk in his counting-room, and then passes to a consideration of the dangers incident to a mercantile life, and of the counteracting influence which good books may exert. Upon all these points his views are sound and useful, and are clothed in language of great force and beauty. "It is my deliberate opinion," he says, "that a man engaged in active pursuits, if he have studious tastes and industrious habits, is most favorably circumstanced for the acquisition of serviceable knowledge." To the correctness of this opinion, we gladly add our emphatic testimony. There is no profession, we conceive, the members of which possess greater advantages for the acquisition of knowledge that will be useful in all the circumstances of public and private life, than the members of the mercantile profession. But without the knowledge which can be obtained only from books, their culture will be imperfect and disproportionate, and they will lose that symmetry of mind and character which should always mark the merchant's own ideal standard.

16

Consumption of the Lungs, or Decline. The Causes, Symptoms, and Rational Treatment. With the Means of Prevention.
 By T. H. YEOMAN, M. D. Revised by a Boston Physician.
 Boston : J. Munroe & Co. 1850. 12mo. pp. 103.

A REPRINT, for the most part, of an English work which has already received judicious commendation from critics competent to decide on its merits. Every book which throws any light upon this wasting agency of death, or imparts relief or comfort to those who are seemingly destined for its victims, will find a welcome in many hearts.

17

Religious Thoughts and Opinions. By WILLIAM VON HUMBOLDT, Minister of State to the King of Prussia. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 1851. 16mo. pp. 171.

THIS is a reprint of a London volume, entitled "Thoughts and Opinions of a Statesman," which appeared in a series of "Small

Books on Great Subjects." The original source is a German work, whose title is "Letters of William von Humboldt to a Female Friend." There is a very singular history involved in the book, — one that will strike many readers as more than romantic. The little American volume contains many lofty and precious thoughts, expressed with simplicity and directness.

18

New Manuals. — Two new manuals for students in academies and colleges, which will afford essential help in two difficult branches of education, bear the following titles. "The Principles of Chemistry, illustrated by Simple Experiments. By Dr. Julius Adolph Stöckhardt. Translated from the Third German Edition, by C. H. Peirce, M. D. Cambridge: John Bartlett. 1850." (12mo. pp. 656.) "A New Method of Learning the German Language: embracing both the Analytic and Synthetic Modes of Instruction. Being a Plain and Practical Way of acquiring the Art of Reading, Speaking, and Composing German. By W. H. Woodbury. 2d Edition. New York: Mark H. Newman. 1851." (12mo. pp. 504.) From the cursory examination which we have given to these volumes, the former of which is in use in Harvard University, we should consider them as works of the highest value, and as most admirably suited to their several purposes.

Books for the Season.

THE shelves and tables of our numerous bookstores are arranged at this season in their richest holiday aspect. Publishers reasonably expect such encouragement as their generous plans, pursued through the year and brought to their best results at this season, do richly deserve in a community which has the praise of intelligence. We cannot but note from year to year a rapid improvement in the material and in the outward adornment of our literature. Though our authors receive but a very trifling remuneration from their works, compared with the profits from a copyright in England, the pens of many writers seem to work as busily and as cheerfully here as there. So long as our publishers are at liberty to cull from all the products of the English press the freshest and richest works, and to offer them here at prices which the sale of a large number of copies, and the subtraction of the author's dues, allow to be barely enough to cover the manual labor of the mechanics, — so long our own authors cannot expect to live by their pens. The Harpers have given us ex-

cellent editions of the Lives of Southey, Chalmers, and Leigh Hunt, at about one sixth of the price of the English editions of those works. Till Congress and Parliament shall agree upon an international copyright, English writers must find all the solace that they can in the thought that they are ministering without reward to the enjoyment of thousands and thousands in this country, at whose happy firesides during our long winters English literature, in its freshest shape, is one great staple of happiness.

The largest and best of the gift-books of the season exhibit a partnership of coöperation between the two countries. In that splendid volume, published by the Appletons of New York, and edited by Dr. Wainwright, under the title of "The Saviour with Prophets and Apostles," the plates are from England, while the letter-press is from our own writers. Ticknor, Reed, & Fields's exquisite edition of Longfellow's *Evangeline* presents another specimen of combination between foreign artists and a native literary product. Professor Reed's beautiful edition of Gray's *Poems and Letters*, with a Life and illustrative notes, may be regarded under the same aspect. Mr. Bartlett, of Cambridge, offers us two delightful volumes, which, though designed especially for young children, will detain the eyes of many persons of various ages. They contain all the most famous lyrics and stories of childhood, adorned with numerous engravings of surprising elegance and liveliness. They bear the title of "A Treasury of Pleasure-Books," and are imported from London in large quantities by Mr. Bartlett.

Among the numerous seasonable publications of Messrs Phillips, Sampson, & Co. are several elegant gift-books in the richest style of art. Those who relish modern poetry best when its effusions are scattered over pages at intervals which are filled with gems of established reputation, will appreciate a volume from these publishers, prepared by Miss H. F. Gould, which, under the title of "The Diosma, a Perennial," embraces some original pieces of her own, and a choice selection from a large number of admired writers. The rural story of "Frank and Fanny," by Mrs. Clara Moreton, with its pretty engravings, will please and instruct the young.

Messrs. Ticknor, Reed, & Fields have published two new volumes by "Grace Greenwood," which our readers probably know is not the name of Miss Clarke, who is their authoress. Her new collection of "Poems" (12mo, pp. 190) is introduced by the prettiest one in the volume, and that is a portrait of the writer of what follows. We do not pride ourselves on our judgment of modern poetry, and do not read enough of it to institute compari-

sons, but we think that good judges will pronounce what is in this volume good. Her other new volume, called "History of my Pets" (24mo, pp. 109), is a sweet little gift for children, and is certain of being received by them with favor. The pencil of Billings has given efficient aid to illustrate the pleasant biographies of the pet cat, cockerel, hawk (?), dogs, pony, drake, cosset, and red-breast.

"Home Ballads: a Book for New England. In Three Parts. By Abby Allen." Boston: James Munroe, & Co. 1851. 16mo. pp. 238. This is a volume of prose and poetry, and the third part of it is published separately under the title of "Kris Kringle's Christmas Book, a Gift for Children" (16mo, pp. 80). There is great variety in the contents, which we have hastily looked over, and among the pieces are some of a simple beauty of sentiment, and others of a lively, cheerful, and spirited tone, adapting the volumes to the tastes of different readers. The beauty of the type will commend them to purchasers, and the title should help their sale largely.

Messrs. Crosby & Nichols have published "Occasional Poems: a New Year's Offering. By Mrs. Susan Hill Todd." 12mo. pp. 216. They are in great measure the productions of a mind and heart under the experience of bereavement, and read with that fact in view, they will engage sympathies which will help to put upon them a fair interpretation, and to attach to them a just estimate.

Messrs. Crosby & Nichols have published, in two handsome volumes, *Sketches of the Life of the late James H. Perkins, of Cincinnati*, with selections from his writings, edited by Rev. William H. Channing. We have in our hands an article upon them, which we are obliged to defer to our next number.

Among the fresh publications of this firm are some pretty books for young persons, the titles of which we give: — "A Study for Young Men; or a Sketch of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton. By Rev. Thomas Binney." 18mo. pp. 149. This is a Lecture by the Rev. Dr. Binney, a distinguished English Dissenting minister, before the Young Men's Christian Association, in London, and presents in an interesting way the honored and useful career of an eminent philanthropist. — "Bardouc, or the Goatherd of Mount Taurus. A Persian Tale, translated from the French." 24mo. pp. 213. Whoever will but read the alluring preface to this little tale must find himself engaged by the promise of a story which was designed to meet such a peculiar occasion. — "All for the Best, or the Peppermint Man. A Moral Tale. By T. S. Arthur." 24mo. pp. 130. This author's stories are al-

ways simple and lively, and bear a good moral. — "A Strike for Freedom, or Law and Order. A Book for Boys. By Mrs. L. C. Tuthill." 2d edition. 24mo. pp. 150. A story of some truant boys, who set up for themselves, with their adventures, the fun and the folly of their undertaking, their repentance and forgiveness, and the wisdom of their experiment. — "Cousin Hatty's Hymns and Twilight Stories." 24mo. pp. 116. Pretty little pictures of bright and attractive things, such as children love, illustrate these simple poems, which breathe an affectionate and a devout spirit.

* * Messrs. Crosby & Nichols have just published the Unitarian Congregational Register for the new year, which contains the usual calendar, statistics of our churches and societies, lists of ministers and associations of ministers, and religious and benevolent agencies, with extracts from Unitarian writers.

Messrs. Phillips, Sampson, & Co. will publish immediately, "Home Influences, concluded. A Tale for Mothers and Daughters, by Mrs. Hester Arnold." The original work was written by Grace Aguilar, and a completion of it was promised by her. But her biographer states that she died just as she had finished the manuscript of the first part of it. The same firm will publish a new and revised edition of the Rev. Mr. Judd's "Margaret, a Tale of the Real and the Ideal," and also a new work by President Hitchcock, of Amherst College, on "The Religion of Geology and its Collateral Sciences."

The forthcoming Biography of Wordsworth, which is in the press of Ticknor, Reed, & Fields, will be looked for with warm interest by all the admirers of the poet.

Messrs. Gould & Lincoln of this city have published a new edition — the second American — of the Life and Correspondence of John Foster, the celebrated essayist. This excellent work was reviewed in the Examiner for January, 1847. We need not, therefore, say any thing more of it now, than to express our gratification that a new edition of so valuable a biography is called for by the public.

The Harpers have issued two more of Abbot's series of Histories, which are highly popular with the young. They are the Life of Xerxes, and the Life of Madame Roland.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

English Unitarian Works.— We have received from England several valuable works in defence or illustration of those views of Christianity which commend themselves to us as nearest to the truth. We would preface the few words which our limited space alone permits us to say concerning these volumes, by informing our readers, that our publishers will procure for them either of these works within a month after receiving the order. Three stout octavo volumes, by the late Rev. Robert Wallace, bear the title of "Antitrinitarian Biography." We have already announced that this work was in preparation, and we shall present in our next number an extended account of its contents and merits. We have before us the fourth edition of "A Vindication of Unitarianism, in Reply to the Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D. D., by James Yates, M. A." (London: Edward T. Whitfield. 1850. 8vo. pp. 386.) A former edition of this very valuable work was reprinted in Boston, though a copy of it is rarely to be met with. We have regarded Mr. Yates's Vindication as, on the whole, the best controversial work in our behalf in a contest which has engaged many able pens, and if we must have another such work published on this side of the water, we hope this will be again reprinted. It has many singular merits. Its scholarship is ample, but not cumbersome. It is candid, clear, intelligible, and very strong in the method and casting of its arguments, while its spirit is eminently Christian throughout. Mr. Yates's book appeared in its original form thirty-five years ago, and though, for the larger portion of the period that has since elapsed, he has devoted his time principally to scientific and the higher literary pursuits, he has been the steadfast and effective advocate of the views which he so ably vindicated. The controversy which called forth this work began with a sermon preached by him at the opening of a Unitarian chapel in Glasgow. This sermon was assailed by Dr. Wardlaw, a distinguished minister of the Scotch Secession Church, who still lives, greatly honored, and now, as always, esteemed by those who differ with him. Though some sharp passages occurred in the course of the controversy, its conclusion found the combatants on terms of Christian amity, and it was the commendable desire of both of them that all asperities should be expurgated from the pages which contained their several arguments. Though we instinctively turn away from all such volumes as seem to us to be filled with the mere jot and tittle of controversy, and hold our own Unitarian views with such a perfect conviction that no argument can shake them and no demonstration can confirm them, we have found ourselves engaged on the lucid and instructive pages of this volume, and had read it nearly through without any intention to do more than merely to refresh our remembrance of it. While the book is devoted to the discussion of the one single point of the Unity against the Trinity, it incidentally recognizes other contested points. Some new materials of a very interesting character, and referring to matters of recent and present debate, will be found in the Appendix. We commend the work most heartily to all

who would possess a volume which discusses in a most able, scholarly, dignified, and Christian way one of the great themes of our religious literature.

We should judge that the most laborious of all our brethren in Great Britain is the Rev. Dr. Beard. His publications, always of the highest order, and devoted chiefly to the defence, the exposition, and the illustration of revealed religion, would wellnigh constitute a library for a village minister. While we are waiting for some more volumes of his "Library of Christian Literature," to which we have more than once referred in our pages, we must make brief mention of two little works of his which have an especial value for Sunday-School teachers. "A Biblical Atlas, with a brief Geographical Introduction, and a complete Scriptural Gazetteer," (London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co., 1849, 8vo, pp. 42,) is well described by its title, and offers in a very simple form the results of the most recent researches on its subject. The maps are beautifully drawn. "A Biblical Reading-Book for Schools and Families, containing, with Illustrative Sketches in Sacred Geography, History, and Antiquities, a Life of Christ, and forming a Popular Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures, especially those of the New Testament." (London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. 1849. 16mo. pp. 292.) A small volume follows this title, but it is a volume within which is compressed a vast amount of information. Dr. Beard has been so long engaged in elementary instruction, and has so carefully kept up with the course of criticism and investigation as they bear upon the Bible, that he is furnished as but few even among ministers are furnished for the good work to which he consecrates his time and zeal.

If any of our readers would avail themselves of the facilities of inter-communication by indulging themselves with a weekly paper from England, we would most heartily recommend to them "The Inquirer," which is published in London every Saturday, at sixpence sterling per number. Besides its full political, literary, and ordinary secular contents, it contains a record of all the public doings in our denomination abroad, and bears evidence of the best talents and the most earnest Christian zeal and purposes in its editor and its contributors. We have learned to set a high value upon the paper. We may mention here, — a fact that may help to quiet the fears which many persons have of a passage across the ocean, — that we have received every number of the Inquirer from its commencement. The number now before us is the 437th, and the numbers have for the most part come over singly, week by week, so that four hundred and thirty-seven vessels have successively crossed the ocean in safety to assure the regularity of these papers.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

London District Unitarian Society. — This Society was formed in London during the last year. Its purposes and principles, when first publicly announced, called out some slight expressions of differences of opinion among our brethren in England. Many feared that its operations might conflict with the interests of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, which, having been formed contemporaneously with our own, was supposed to have occupied the ground and to engage the effi-

cient agencies of the denomination. Others thought that the new Society originated in a spirit somewhat akin to fault-finding, and might in its workings alienate some who were not disposed to any very intimate sectarian fellowship. The friends of the new movement made a strong appeal for it, based on the need of sympathy, which was felt by many, in their religious feelings and in their philanthropic efforts. The social distinctions which weigh far more pressingly in England than in this country, the almost entire absence of personal relationships and acquaintance between the attendants upon the London Unitarian chapels, and the constant complaints of the chilling influences which prevented the growth of our body, — these and other considerations engaged a sufficient number of persons in the new project to insure for it at least a trial. We have been interested in marking, from time to time, its progress and its fruits, because it had so natural an origin that much real good was to be expected to result from it.

All opposition to the Society seems to have died away, or to have ceased from any public expression of itself. Some of our brethren who seemed most distrustful of it have coöperated in its measures and taken a part in its social meetings. There has been no conflict between it and the Association, and we have reason to believe that it has drawn to our views the attention and sympathy of many who needed just such a Society to attract them. London is such a world in itself, with such long distances and such high walls and such a turmoil of life within it, that nothing but a very strong magnetic influence can bind fellow-believers into any social relations in which classes and cliques may be forgotten, and speculative religious convictions shall be the means of one fellowship. The purposes and methods of the Society are very simple. A small fee annually insures membership. Lectures, discussions, and social meetings are the principal means that are relied upon. Quarterly social meetings are held in some public hall or hotel, at which, for a small sum, a simple repast is partaken of, and then, seated around the table with the chairman in his place, the members discuss some subject which has been previously agreed upon and announced. At the last quarterly meeting in November, the subject discussed was as follows: — "What course is it the duty of Unitarians to pursue in relation to the present unsettled state of the public mind on religious affairs?"

Several courses of doctrinal lectures have likewise been arranged by the Society, and the delivery of them has drawn together large audiences, so that those who have engaged their labors in them have been exceedingly pleased with the result. A course of lectures on several of the doctrines connected with Trinitarian theology having been advertised for delivery at the Southwark Literary Institution by several Trinitarian ministers, the Society requested the London Unitarian ministers to reply to them, or to their subjects, one by one, in the same place, and the request was cordially complied with. This course was delivered on week-day evenings, as was likewise another course at the Lecture Rooms in Mortimer Street, while a third course has been delivered at the Chapel in Stamford Street on the evenings of Sunday. All these lectures were designed to exhibit the distinctive opinions of Unitarians on the great doctrines and subjects of religious interest. The names of our brethren who take part in this good work of communicating to all who are desirous to hear what in our view are the great truths of revealed religion, are an assurance to us that the work is faithfully and

earnestly performed. How many thousands there must be in London to whom the grounds and substance of our belief would be inexpressibly valuable! Now, too, is a favorable moment for Unitarians to win a new hearing, while Prelatists and Romanists are contending together.

Dedication. — The new Unitarian Church at Wayland was dedicated on Wednesday, Nov. 13. The edifice is a neat and convenient one, sufficiently elegant in its arrangements for good taste, and wisely adapted to the means and the comfort of the society worshipping within it. The Sermon on the occasion was preached by the Rev. E. H. Sears, late of Lancaster. The Dedicatory Prayer was offered by the Rev. Calvin Lincoln. Rev. John B. Wight, Rev. Dr. Field, and Rev. C. C. Sewall took part in the services.

Installation. — The Rev. Frederick Hinckley, late of Norton, was installed as Pastor of the Unitarian Church at Haverhill on Wednesday, Nov. 13. The Sermon was preached by the Rev. G. W. Briggs of Plymouth. The Charge and Prayer of Ordination were by Prof. Francis of Cambridge. Introductory Services by the Rev. F. C. Williams of North Andover. The Fellowship of the Churches by the Rev. H. F. Harrington of Lawrence. The Address to the Society by the Rev. James Richardson, late Pastor of the Society.

Ordination. — Mr. Charles J. Bowen, of the last class from the Cambridge Theological School, was ordained Pastor of the Unitarian Church and Society at Newburyport, on Wednesday, Nov. 20. The Sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. Putnam of Roxbury. The Prayer of Ordination was offered by Rev. Dr. Miles of Lowell. The Rev. Dr. Hall of Providence gave the Charge, the Rev. J. F. W. Ware of Cambridgeport gave the Fellowship of the Churches, and the Rev. A. P. Peabody of Portsmouth, N. H., addressed the Society. The Rev. Messrs. Woodbury of Concord, N. H. Frothingham of Salem, and Huntington of Boston, also took part in the services.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

MARCH, 1851.

ART. I.—MEMOIR AND WRITINGS OF J. H. PERKINS.*

THIS is a monument, fairer than marble, reared by a surviving friend over one who has gone. Their intimacy from childhood seems to have been closer than that of brothers, and the Sketches of Mr. Perkins's early life contained in the first volume are written in such a frank and open and affectionate spirit, that they read more like personal confessions than a memoir. Those who knew Mr. Perkins will feel that the very man has been Daguerreotyped on these pages. His biographer shows how the tenderest friendship and the fondest memory are consistent with the most entire and simple truth.

Mr. Perkins was a remarkable man. He came up as nearly to the idea expressed in the phrase "a man of talent,"—he had the varied capabilities implied in that phrase, and that elasticity of mind which shows itself in a ready aptitude for the most diverse occupations, in as high a degree,—as any man we ever knew. We have known many who were superior to him in a single department, but never one who possessed more power, capable of being made so easily available in so many

* *The Memoir and Writings of James Handasyd Perkins.* Edited by WILLIAM HENRY CHANNING. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1851. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 527, 502.

different directions. But however important this may have been in its place, it was not this which gave him his position of respect and influence. Were those who knew him best to describe him, we think that the first idea which would rise to their minds would be that of a noble, large-hearted, magnanimous man, who, though most tolerant in his judgment of other men, had a certain generous scorn of every thing dishonorable, selfish, or unworthy. His conscience had in it the quality of magnanimity. He was as patient and forbearing towards others, as he was exacting towards himself. He was straightforward as the sunshine, and knew nothing of by-ends and indirect methods. We cannot conceive that he should ever have been guilty of any untruthfulness; while those who had any affairs with him soon learned that he was governed not merely by common honesty, but by a rectitude of principle, which caused him to deal hardly with himself alone. He paid little thought to popular favor, he sacrificed without a regret promising opportunities of gain, and from early years dedicated his life to works of usefulness. He had great social gifts, and without the least pretension, or effort, or thought of becoming so, he could not help being the centre of any circle in which he moved. And there was such an independence, originality, and truthfulness in thought and speech and act, that, while most closely connected with others, he possessed always a marked and individual character of his own. In regard to superficial matters, he was often changeable, and sometimes apparently wayward, but it was because they were superficial, and because, while they interfered with more important ends, he would not suffer himself to be a slave to words and phrases and conventionalisms. But in the midst of minor peculiarities of character, he was one of the truest, bravest, simplest, and most generous of men.

In this connection, we cannot omit a reference to his religious views and character. They were the result of profound personal experience and of much individual thought. Like every thing else in his mind and character, his religious qualities bore the unequivocal stamp of reality. He was an earnestly believing and devout man. The absence of all pretence, the evident sincerity and fervor of his convictions, gave force to his simplest words;

for those who heard him knew that he was not uttering traditional phrases, but phrases full of an intense meaning to himself. He troubled himself little about appearances, but was as anxious to *be* as so many are to *seem*.

Mr. Perkins had the qualities both of mind and character which admirably fitted him for a new country. It was a judicious step for himself, and a happy one for others, when, at the age of twenty-one, he determined to make Cincinnati his place of residence. Cincinnati, which now contains a population of 140,000, and which promises before many years to be one of the capitals of the world, was at that time a comparatively small place of about 30,000 inhabitants. It was, however, already the intellectual centre of the West, and its society possessed a charm which can scarcely exist except in the first settlement of a country. The population, being composed principally of recent immigrants, was made up to a great extent of persons in youth or early manhood. It was a rare thing to see an old man. Such an amount of youthful blood gave a peculiar air of life and activity to the city. Few whom you met were natives of the place, but had come thither from every quarter of the world. Many who had been the ornaments of society in the cities of the Atlantic coast had here, for one reason or another, made their home. Among these was much more than a fair proportion of highly educated young men and cultivated women. There had not been time as yet to form those cliques and circles which necessarily grow up in older places. Every person stood very much on his own merits. Society was open, and social relations were determined, not by the accident of relationship or property, but by personal affinities. Those came together who were attracted by similarity of taste or culture; and nothing could be more frank, hospitable, and delightful, than the society organized on this natural principle. We write with freedom, for what took place in Cincinnati twenty years ago, from the great changes between, seems to belong to a remote historical era, rather than to our own time. We do not believe it possible for so much cultivation and elegance, such unbounded hospitality, such frank intercourse, to exist together anywhere except in the earlier period of a city's history. From the necessity of the case, strangers become friends,

and friends take the place of kindred. They necessarily rely upon each other, and must act in concert for common and important ends. There are some that read these pages, who will remember what we imperfectly describe; and we think it will strike them with surprise, when they call to mind how many of those then just entering life, and in the habit of sharing together the noble hospitality of the friends among their number who were a little older and had been somewhat more prosperous, have since become widely distinguished in different careers. As we write, there rises before us a fair company, richly endowed, with swelling spirits and energetic natures, entering on the greatest tasks as upon the pleasures of a holiday, thinking it no hardship to do or to endure, and resolutely bent on filling both an honorable and a useful place in the world. Some of them are now in their graves, but many of them have lived to occupy honorably the most responsible positions.

Among the number was Mr. Perkins. At that time the institutions of Cincinnati and of the West were in a forming state. The chaos was gradually shaping itself into a world. Schools, churches, customs of business, benevolent institutions, were assuming a determinate form. It was the time when foundations were laid for coming generations, and therefore a time when heavy responsibilities were thrown on each individual man. So much was to be done that young men hardly out of their minority, of necessity, frequently occupied positions of the greatest moment. They were obliged as they best might to plan for future times, with the conviction that as a community begins, it is very likely to go on. No one felt more justly than Mr. Perkins what one in such a situation might and ought to do. We have no doubt that the demands made on every right-minded young man in a city such as Cincinnati then was, had much to do with the development of the best qualities of his character.

He had been originally educated as a merchant; but on coming to Cincinnati in 1832, at the age of twenty-one, he commenced the study of law with Judge Walker, and, having completed the prescribed term, was admitted to the bar. He entered upon the practice of his profession with the most prosperous omens of success, having

already gained for himself a high reputation for ability, for his legal attainments, and his capacity for the transaction of business. Almost at the outset he had an amount of business confided to him such as most men gain only after years of patient waiting. His talent as a public speaker, the clearness of his intellect, his solid judgment and power of argument, won for him general admiration, and secured for him the respect and confidence of the leading men in his own profession. His fondness for the study of the great principles of jurisprudence as a science always remained, but the practice of law, partly on account of health, but principally because of moral considerations, grew distasteful, and at the end of about a year he relinquished it. He had already been connected with the *Western Monthly Magazine*, and was at this time the editor of a daily political newspaper. In addition to this, he became the editor of the *Chronicle*, a weekly literary paper, in which there appeared week after week many columns from his pen, of essays, tales, poetry, and criticism. He wrote with surprising facility, and such was his intellectual discipline, and so varied were his resources, and so easily did his thoughts take graceful and striking forms, that whatever he wrote possessed a peculiar charm which was certain to secure for it attention. In 1835, the *Chronicle* was united with the *Mirror*, and of this he became the editor, in conjunction with William D. Gallagher and Thomas H. Shreve, names since then known throughout the West, in connection with literature and political editorship. Under their united management, the *Mirror* became one of the most spirited and brilliant sheets ever published in this country. It was not, however, the time as yet, in the West, for such a publication to prosper. He was obliged to relinquish his editorial labors, and the failure of his health inducing him to turn his thoughts towards a country life, he determined, in 1835, to join some highly valued friends in forming an establishment for mining, milling, and manufacturing at Pomeroy, on the Ohio. In the general disasters, however, which soon after overwhelmed the business of the whole country, he was a sharer, and was obliged to give up projects which he had much at heart. The following letter, written at this time, shows the spirit in which Mr. Perkins met this reverse of fortune.

“*Pomeroy, September, 1837.* — Our worldly walkings and workings here have produced no fruit but certain potatoes and cauliflowers, together with a small modicum of wisdom. Some four thousand silver dollars have dwindled, under the united influence of bad times and worse management, to four hundred, paper currency, ragged and very greasy. Our house — just built here, under the shade of sugar-maples and oaks, with the Ohio a few hundred feet before us, and the mighty sand-cliffs, that whisk us back into past eternity, behind — we are forced to sell at half cost; and having but just unpacked and settled, as we thought, must pack up again and take up our march for another corner of the ‘Garden of Eden,’ as we think it best to call this earth, in order that she may have no cause of quarrel. Whither we shall go is somewhat uncertain, but most probably on to a small farm of ten or twenty acres, somewhere in the vicinity of Cincinnati, there to raise potatoes and fruit-trees, and write articles that might as well not be written.

“I have always had a standard with respect to daily employments, that I have been trying, so far without success, to live up to. I want hard bodily labor enough to keep me in health; enough of business to exercise my order, activity, and perceptive powers, and leisure enough for reading and writing to keep me from petrifying into a thorough man of business. Having weak eyes yet, I am forced to find daylight enough for all these things, and this, as society is now constituted, is no easy matter. In coming here I thought I had attained my end, but bad advice as to cost of building, bad management on my own part, and somewhat unlooked for mishaps, have disappointed me. I now propose to try the experiment on a smaller scale, content myself with a log-cabin, literally, and make a bold push for independence on an income of \$150 per annum! Such is a chart of my proposed course in a worldly way.

“Spiritually, I fear I have done scarce as well as in business. I have met some hard rubs, and my skin was too thin to stand them. However, I believe, all things considered, that both my outer and inner tumbles of the year past will help me in finally gaining the prize I am after, and that more speedily and certainly than an easier journey would have done. A great deal of latent selfishness still pervades my frame, and it wants a heavy pressure to force it out; and if that which has been on me has sometimes expelled it in explosive quantities, still so much of it is gone, which is a great comfort.” — Vol. I. pp. 104 – 106.

In the winter of 1837 – 38, he returned to Cincinnati, where, before making any permanent arrangements for the future, he employed himself in various literary occupations. At this time he prepared a volume containing

the Constitutional Opinions of Judge Marshall, which received the highest commendation from Justice Story. He had also half prepared another volume, containing reminiscences of the St. Domingo insurrection by his father, who was there during the whole of that eventful period. The appearance of another work on the same subject, which seemed to forestall the market, prevented his completing it. He was also, as he continued to be to the end of his life, a constant contributor to Western periodicals, and to such works at the East as the *New York Review* and the *North American Review*, and a writer in our own pages.

Mr. Perkins had always been deeply interested in schools, in the general subject of education, and in the establishment of institutions which had for their object the moral and social welfare of the community. His attention was now particularly drawn to the subject of pauperism. Carrying out into action long-cherished convictions and feelings, he at length resolved to devote himself to this subject, and in the winter of 1838 - 39 he entered on his ministry to the poor. From that period till his death, he was a centre of charitable action in Cincinnati. He was singularly qualified for the work he had undertaken, possessing at the same time commanding abilities, great soundness of judgment, an unwearied benevolence, and the universal confidence of society. In lectures and in print, he treated largely of nearly every question relating to social progress. The wisdom of his views, and his ability to discuss these most difficult questions, are evident from the extracts which Mr. Channing has given from his writings. We know of few volumes which contain more that is worth the reading on these matters. And when it is remembered how much of this was written between the age of twenty-five and thirty, there are few who will not be surprised at the breadth, the far-reaching foresight, and the early maturity of his views.

His love of independence was seen here as elsewhere. In order to support himself, he opened a school for young ladies. Teaching was a work which he loved, and he continued it with signal success to the end of his life. In the mean time the pulpit of the Unitarian society became vacant, and, at the earnest desire of its members,

he became their minister. He however relinquished none of his other labors, and retained the place only until the society obtained the services of the Rev. Mr. Fenner, a young man whose early and beautiful promise was speedily cut off. At his death, Mr. Perkins again yielded to the urgency of his friends, and resumed his place as minister of the society, and continued such during the remainder of his life. As a preacher, he possessed peculiar, but very remarkable powers. He was listened to with equal respect and admiration, and his influence for all good ends was felt throughout the city.

It was our intention to have extracted largely from these volumes, but we find that we have already consumed much of the space allotted to us. Mr. Shreve says of Mr. Perkins, in a letter to his biographer, that, had he devoted himself to humorous literature, "he would have stood at the head of American writers in that line." We think there is scarcely any exaggeration in the remark. The following piece, written when he had hardly passed beyond the age of boyhood, will give some idea of the mixture of pathos and humor which were always ready to flow forth, but were checked by the more serious realities of after life.

"MY AUNT ESTHER.

"My first and best, and oldest of aunts! and yet no more my relation than the town-pump. Aunt Esther! she was the nursing mother of the whole dynasty of —s, father and grandfather, son and grandson; — they had all been fondled and spanked, washed, combed, and clothed by the venerable maiden. From her I learned to love 'lasses candy'; from her I learned to hate Tom Jefferson. Many an evening as I sat by her rush-bottomed and rickety chair, threading her needle, or holding, while she wound, skeins of silk or yarn, that I thought must be as long as the equator, — many an evening has she discoursed of the arch-rebel Napoleon, whom 'she would have torn to flinders,' she said, 'if she could only have got her hands on him'; though the next day she would set free the very mouse that had stolen her last pet morsel of cheese; for she was a very Uncle Toby, or rather Aunt Toby, in such matters.

"She told me of Napoleon, and her little work-table was the battle-field. Here was the ball of yarn, and there was the half-finished stocking, and yonder was the big Bible, supported by the spectacle-case. Old Boney himself moved among them in the form of a knitting-needle; and to this day I cannot think of the

Little Corporal, but as a tall bit of cold steel, with a head made of beeswax.

“ From her, too, came my portrait of Washington, whom she had seen during his visit to the North. Year after year did those well-beloved lips pronounce his eulogy, and often was the hourly prayer put up by me for a long life to Aunt Esther and General Washington ; little did I dream that one who to me had just begun to live, had been dead these ten years and more !

“ And then came the war and the Hartford Convention ; and such a time as we had of it, up in our little back-room ! I don't know what it was that preserved the nation ; for there was Aunt Esther and I, and the whole race of —s, in such a passion that we almost walked to England dryshod.

“ Aunt Esther had one fault, — she was always too cleanly in her notions. It was probably because of her Federal and aristocratic associations, but certain it is that she could not even see a dirty boy without wanting to wash his hands. And this her most prominent organ was exercised most fully upon generation after generation, as each marched through her dominions. ‘ As bad as to be washed by Aunt Esther, ’ was a proverb in the dynasty. For many a long year no lines in the language were to me so pathetic and soul-harrowing as those from the Columbiad : —

‘ Still on thy rocks the broad Atlantic roars,
And washes still unceasingly thy shores.’

To be ‘ washed unceasingly ’ was my beau-ideal of misery.

“ Aunt Esther, familiar as she was, was still a mysterious being to me. I had never met any other of her name ; and, having early in life heard the Book of Esther read, always thought of my old nurse in connection with Ahasuerus and Mordecai, and the tall gallows. Nor was the mystery diminished on being told, when I asked how long it was since Mordecai, that it was hundreds and thousands of years. How old she was I did not dare to ask !

“ Brought up to bring up others, the venerable matron loved nothing so dearly as Scotch snuff and noisy children. When the storm waxed loudest in the nursery, she was most in her element, and walked undisturbed amid

‘ The wreck of horses and the crash of toys.’

“ Her chief text and comfort was that in which we are told that our Saviour blessed the children brought to him, and said that of such was the kingdom of heaven ; for to her it conveyed the idea that the place of rest would be brimfull of babies.

“ And I grew up, and another generation came forward to claim my rocking-horses and my long-legged chairs. I went to school ; and when I came home, I found Aunt Esther just as of old, only (as the saying is) a good deal more so. But though to

me time was a matter of some import, she defied it. Nay, I received a letter from my cousin, who had just been married, telling me that Aunt Esther had danced at her wedding. — was the old lady's last favorite; gentle and kindly, she loved her foster-mother more than many do their own parents, and she meant to take the ancient to her new home, she told me. But when I arrived at Boston again, I found that this had not been done; Aunt Esther could not leave the old nursery, with its yellow floor and barred windows; and as little could she bear to lose her pet. From the day of —'s wedding, she began to go out; her work on earth was done; and from the arms of the last she had brought up in the fear of the Lord, she passed away to meet her new colony of infants beyond the skies.

"In one corner of the church-yard there had been a great oak, of which all had departed but a shell of bark a few feet high. From this shell, within a year or two, a young, tall sprout had sprung up. Under that emblem of the resurrection they laid the body of Aunt Esther. Above her they placed a three-sided obelisk; upon the west side was carved the form of an aged woman, on the brink of the grave; upon the east, that of a bright spirit, springing from the same grave; while upon the front was her name and age, — 'Esther Pray, aged 91 years,' with a part of her favorite text, perverted and yet true, — 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven.'" — Vol. I. pp. 19–22.

The following passage, written in 1834, expresses better than any words of ours what we believe to have been the controlling views and principles of his life: —

"I am come to regard the world as an arena in which I have to do two things, — *improve others* and *improve myself*. I look upon myself, upon you, and upon all of us, as capable of improvement, infinitely. 'He that is faithful over a few things shall be ruler over many.' I am not willing to seek power here, simply because I look forward to the time when I shall have worlds at my command. I wish in this life to *fit* myself for that command; and the only way of doing so is to perfect my nature, as far as I can. The highest, the divinest power in the world, is that of love, for by it God governs." — Vol. I. p. 85.

The following passage we quote from a letter to a young friend on the subject of Reading: —

"You could scarce ask me a harder question, than the one you now ask, 'What books should a young man read between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four?' It is puzzling to answer such questions, not only because no two persons ought to go through the same course of reading, but because we study, not to heap up so much miscellaneous knowledge, but to learn those things of

which we are peculiarly ignorant, and to cultivate those of our faculties which most require it. While, therefore, I may be able to advise *you* very well, knowing you as I do, I am wholly unable to advise your brother; and as to the giving hints adapted to all, I would sooner turn quack, and give one dose for all constitutions and all diseases; for I think it better to trifle thus with the body than the soul. But there are some remarks which will apply equally to all persons and all courses, and to some of these I will ask your thought.

“I would first, then, say, never read without an *object*. If you have ever been called on to study with reference to the attainment of some definite end, you will remember that what you thus learned remained with you long after most that you read had been forgotten. Not alone because you went deeply into it at the time, but because it was in your mind so associated and incorporated with many other subjects, that it is easily brought back again in after life. Do not, then, read vaguely and without purpose; know what to expect from your book before you begin it; and at every step, see what bearing what you have read has upon the points before you. Many men read every thing twice, — once to find out what to read for, and again, to learn what is to be learned. Read, therefore, few very new books, the merits and objects of which you know nothing about; wait till you know whereof the last publication treats, and how it treats it.

“Next, I would advise you to read by *subjects*, not by volumes. I have known many scholars who had never read a book through in their lives, except, of course, those of mere amusement. In this way you get comparatively whole, not fractional views, and both sides of a question; you may thus escape partyism, partiality, and narrow notions.

“In the third place, I would recommend you not to commonplace your reading, but to *think it over, digest it*, and, if you have time, reduce your own views, obtained from what you have read, to writing, in a blank book. The thinking may be done while you are walking, waiting tea, sitting over the fire, or in attendance for an unpunctual friend. The secret of writing much and easily consists, I fancy, in sitting down to write with your thoughts already in your mind, instead of fishing in the inkstand for them.

“My fourth piece of advice is, to draw up for yourself a *systematic list* of all the subjects of human knowledge, made as particular as you please. By a glance at this you may see at once how little you know; may refresh your knowledge of your ignorance, and see to what subjects you most need to turn your attention.

“Lastly, I would say, keep by you a *blank book*, arranged as an index, in which you can enter references to those many pas-

sages and facts met with daily by a student, which have no immediate connection with the subject of the work in which they are found, and which we so often remember to have seen, but cannot think where.

“I will now call your mind to a question, which every systematic reader must ask himself, — Shall my reading be confined to one or two subjects until I am thorough in them, or shall it be general and superficial? Most whose advice you would follow would, I think, advise the first; for my own part, I am in favor of the last course. It is true, that superficial knowledge should be avoided where it can be; but to my mind, the true question is this, — Does it best become a being destined for eternity to gain a broad view of all that he can know, though a very imperfect one, or one more narrow and more perfect? If you look into what is said in favor of thorough studies, you will find them upheld, generally, as the means to gain worldly power or distinction; and, when this is not the case, they are contended for by those who have little or no faith in the doctrine, that our studies, habits, and occupations here will affect our fate hereafter. But to me it is clear that all the powers and capacities of the man are more perfectly developed, and brought out in better proportion, by gaining an outline merely of all knowledge within our reach, than by pursuing any one branch of knowledge into all its details; and the ridicule and scorn which have been heaped upon ‘smatterers,’ though it may properly apply to those who go from subject to subject without purpose and without system, cannot, with justice, fall upon students who go perfectly as far as they go, and stop because they perceive the inutility of going farther. Some one subject, it is true, will become the prominent one in every man’s mind, and it is right it should be so, for every man owes it to the world, to extend, in some direction, the circle of knowledge, if it be in his power; but the prominence differs from the entire predominance of one subject. A man may carry his researches in natural or mental philosophy, history, or natural history, beyond the common line, and yet by no means give up other subjects. This has been done by some of the most eminent men in all branches, — Milton, Newton, Locke, Coleridge, Goethe. If you read the works of Coleridge, for instance, you will find continual references to all branches of natural and political science, and will see that from these he has drawn many of his most admirable illustrations, and gained from them that breadth and unity of thought which must ever distinguish him, despite his many faults; and the great German is a still more striking instance.

“But the habit of general and systematic study is by no means common among either great or small men. We are apt, if lawyers, physicians, or clergymen, to read upon no subject as we

should read, except that belonging to our profession, and seldom upon that. Other subjects we take up for amusement, and lay them down again to resume or not as occasion occurs. This I would advise you never to do. If a work on botany or biography falls in your way, do not touch it, unless you see that you can pursue that of which it treats to some purpose; and, above all things, eschew the habit of standing about a library or reading-room, dipping for a moment into this book or that review, and then turning to another.

“Reviews are at times of great use, because they compress knowledge and give references, and also because they excite an interest in subjects that, but for them, we might never approach; but they are, to the student, edged tools, to be used with great caution.

“I would say, then, let your reading be *general*, but by no means *promiscuous or vague*. You may learn enough of nature to have the God of nature always before you, to value all that he has made, and from his works, to learn the many lessons of mercy, faith, love, and courage that they were meant to teach, and yet be what men will call a smatterer; for you need know few names, and may be ignorant of many standard authors. But I should think you far wiser to gain this smattering than to give the time spent in its gain to becoming perfect and thorough in the dates of history, or the minute facts of statistics.

“But, while I advise a large field of study, I beg you to guard against the too current practice of making a very imperfect knowledge of a subject enough, whatever chances may occur for increasing it; I would be content with imperfection, because general perfection is impossible; but be as thorough as you can be, and never think that you know enough of a subject when opportunities offer to increase your knowledge of it. There is an essential difference between the man that is content with a scant view of the whole now, because he hopes to perfect that view hereafter, and the man that is content with it because he cares to know no more.

“One more remark, and I close; in choosing your subject of study, have your eye ever upon the great truth that should be our guide in every pursuit, and a full, ever-present, ever-influential faith in which is the beginning, and body, and end of all philosophy, — the truth that we are *immortal spirits*. Having this in view, you will not, as some do, spend years in acquiring knowledge that cannot have any influence, as far as we can see, upon the eternal interests of yourself or others. Having this in view, you will never narrow your reading to the newspapers and magazines of the day; nor yet despise them, for they are your only means of communication with the great mass of your fellows.

It is for want of faith in this truth, that the lawyer becomes a mere lawyer, the politician a devotee to the small interests of the time, and the tradesman a bondman of trade. Keep this truth, then, ever before you, by attendance on public worship, by private devotion, by the study of Scripture, by the study of nature, by reflecting upon your own powers, and going over again in thought your past life, in the opportunities and changes of which you may see the hand of God schooling you for the future, as clearly as you see it in the stars of night, the clouds of noonday, or the plan and formation of your own body." — Vol. I. pp. 92–96.

In all Mr. Perkins's speculations respecting the progress of society, he started from one fundamental principle, of which his other views and all his undertakings were but the development, — the necessity of raising the individual man to a higher level of excellence and Christian virtue, — a principle often stated in words, but by him intensely felt and faithfully acted upon. In his labors as a teacher, a preacher, and a minister to the poor, in his efforts to remedy pauperism and to improve prison discipline, in what he wrote in regard to slavery, education, political economy, and the various theories of social progress, we find this idea always prominent. It determined his course respecting himself. He sought variety of occupations because he believed that, if it was less favorable to worldly success, it tended to promote a larger and healthier development of all the moral and mental faculties of the man. However such a course might be adapted to persons of less subsistent characters and feebler purposes, there can be no doubt that it was favorable to him, and that, though he in some measure sacrificed the distinction which would have been easily within his reach had he confined himself to any one department of labor, it secured to him as a man a far higher and broader mind and character.

We quote one passage on the subject of slavery, which, remembering that it was written in 1836, and published in a work that depended almost as much on its Southern as on its Northern subscribers, we think will give a good illustration of the clearness of his mind, his method of thinking, and his personal independence.

"The so-called friends of the negro may be divided into two great classes, — those who look on him as a brute, and those who think him a man. If the former wish him free, it is that he may have more yam, hominy, and sleep; the latter would break

his chains, because the enchained man can never properly perfect the powers that belong to him as a man. One of the first class, after a visit to slave lands, will often defend slavery, because the African has better feed and a wider sty than the English and German peasants. Should one of the second class go with him, he would think of the palsied intellect, the strangled affections, the broken sense of right, and the entire moral stupor, that are scarce separable from slavery, however kind and Christian the slave-owner. The first would say, 'The slave is happy; he wants no more than he has'; the last would think, 'How miserable this man, that he *knows* not even his degradation!'

"To those who belong to the class of animalists, and who regard freedom as a means to present enjoyment merely, this paper is not addressed. We cannot go so far back, at present, as to discuss the question with them. We would now speak to those who believe the negro to be *in kind* A MAN, who believe freedom to be invaluable as a means to intellectual and moral improvement, and who believe it every man's duty to assist those properly within his influence to improvement, and therefore to freedom. To all such we state but a truism, when we say that, if to the slave present freedom would be the means of improvement, present freedom is his right; but if, in consequence of his unfitness to use freedom aright, or because of laws that degrade the free blacks, present freedom would not be a means whereby he may improve, that then it is not his right, nor is his master, by any principle, bound to free him.

"To the little child, present freedom would not be a means of improvement, and he is kept under restraint; to the idiot and insane man it would not be, and we confine them, even when not likely to injure others; we confine them for their own sake.

"But though the parent does right to restrain his son, being a child, what would we think of him should he do nothing to fit his son to become free? Though he that has charge of a lunatic is not only just, but kind, when he binds his patient even with fetters of iron, if need be, how unjust and inhuman would all think him, should he use no exertion to restore the poor wretch to reason! And what is the slave? He is a little child, needing restraint, needing punishment, but more than all needing *education*. He is a man void of sense, whose limbs it may be needful to fetter, that he may be cured of his disease, and fitted to serve and to advance himself.

"If the negro be *in kind* a man; if man be immortal, and destined ever to advance in intellectual and moral perfectness; if to this advancement freedom of will and self-dependence be essential; and if it be every man's duty to assist his fellows, — then it must be that the negro, however degraded and unworthy *now* to

be free, still has the right, not to liberty, but to that *process which will fit him for liberty*; and it must also be the duty of all that can influence him to urge their influence to this end; it must be that the slave-owner is bound to educate him,—that those who can influence the slave-holder are bound to enforce this duty.

“In this faith we speak, not as abolitionists, not as agitators, not as wishing to excite in any passion or unkind feeling, but as Christians, who think the African a man, having the privileges of a man, and, above all, the privilege of improvement. We are for *ulterior freedom* and *immediate action* that will fit for freedom. Were we now in New England, however, even this opinion we should think it unwise to publish; but standing as we do, upon the limits of the Slave States, and knowing that, of the little circle our voice will reach, many are slave-holders, we speak with more boldness than if afar off; for we have no fear that calm argument addressed to the slave-holders, and published in a Slave State, will be mistaken by any for agitation. But while we say this, we would dissent wholly from the doctrine that slavery is a mere *political* question. It is, and the laws of all Europe and America relative to the slave-trade recognize it as being a *MORAL* question, in which every man, as a man, is interested. The means by which slavery shall be done away in any State belong to politics and that State, the propriety and duty of doing it away belong to morals and the race.” — Vol. I. pp. 189 – 192.

To us there are no more interesting portions of these volumes, than those which describe Mr. Perkins in his domestic relations. He had a home lighted up with a sunshiny affection, of whose benignant influence on himself he was profoundly conscious, and nothing can be more beautiful than the glimpses which are given of it through his letters. He was subject to great despondency of spirits, and needed more than most men the encouragement and the softening influence of cheerful, hopeful, unflinching affection. This he had, and he attributed, we doubt not truly, much of that which was best in his character and happiest in his life to this source.

We have not attempted to give any account of his life, for we hope that our readers will make themselves acquainted with these volumes. They are fitted to inspire one with high aims and purposes. Whatever Mr. Perkins was as a writer or public speaker, he was still more as a man, and his influence depended, not merely on what he said, but on the universal conviction that, what-

ever he said, he was a man who loved truth, honored rectitude, and was ready at any personal cost to dedicate himself to the highest ends. His character was not one of the smooth and rounded ones without defects and without virtues, "in conscience weak, but in discretion strong"; —

"Not his the light war with its feeble rage,
Which prudent scruples with faint passions wage."

All the elements of his character were positive and full of energetic life, and one great value of this memoir consists in its showing the character of one, who, endowed with strong passions and sensitive to the most varied motives, strenuously, persistently, faithfully, learned to subdue them to conscience, and to bring them into subjection to the law of God. It is an admirable example of one who from early years devoted himself to high Christian ends, and through a prevailing love of truth and right made his life a centre of good. His course was one of constant, moral, and religious progress, and it is well that a record of it should be preserved, to inspire with like purposes those who did not know him personally.

We cannot close this notice, without referring to the admirable manner in which Mr. Channing has performed the work assigned to him. The memoir which he has prepared will, more than such works usually do, give to the reader an idea of the man whose portrait is drawn. In the account of his youth spent in the country, so true is the description of a dreaming boyhood and of country scenes and occupations, that many will half fancy that Mr. Channing has taken a page out of their own lives. The memoir is always affectionate, but it is neither vague nor untrue. It discloses all the peculiarities of the man with a kind of confidential freedom, which makes the reader a sharer in the intimacy of friends. The memoir, however, is brief, the two volumes being composed principally of Mr. Perkins's letters and writings. The work will possess an interest for all who like to read the writings of a strong, clear, independent, and, in a high sense of the words, an original thinker. But we would commend it especially to young men. During his life he had a remarkable power to attract and influence them, and

we think that these volumes will be found to possess an influence something like that of his personal character.

We commend them to young men, because they disclose the intellectual and moral struggles through which, in a greater or less degree, all must pass, and at the same time show how the early tendencies of character may be made to take right directions. Above all, we commend them because they exhibit the character of one who from early years strove to govern himself by high principles, and who kept before him, as the result of self-discipline and of all his labors, the highest and worthiest ends.

E. P.

ART. II.—COMTE'S POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY.*

WE have indicated below the title and dimensions of a work more frequently commented on and alluded to than generally read or understood. Excepting the work itself, we know of no source easily accessible whence one may gain a sufficient and fair view of the author's doctrine and purpose. A highly favorable notice of the first two volumes, with some little criticism of his theological position, by Sir David Brewster, appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*; † but this was when those portions only were complete which treat of Mathematics, Astronomy and Physics, — making, in fact, only a part of his introduction. The range of the author's speculation was too briefly indicated as yet to give an opportunity for a sufficient judgment of it as a whole. Some excellent remarks, unhappily not in print, were made nine years ago, in Professor Walker's course of Lowell Lectures. Morell, in his *History of Philosophy*, employs a single chapter in a very brief and unsatisfactory notice of his supposed position, having evidently studied but a small portion of the work, and that carelessly. Altogether the best general view of M. Comte's style of thinking is to be got from

* *Cours de Philosophie Positive*, par AUGUSTE COMTE, ancien Elève de l'Ecole Polytechnique, Répétiteur d'Analyse, etc. Paris: Bachelier. 1830-1842. 8vo. 6 vols. pp. 739, 724, 845, 736, 775, 904.

† Vol. LXVI. p. 167.

his disciple and correspondent, as well as expounder and critic, John Stuart Mill, whose "Logic" is in many of its most valuable parts a simple reproduction and exposition of our author, to whom he does ample and admiring justice.*

The work itself is not very inviting, except to one who is prepared to make a faithful and patient study of the subject it treats. Its method is careful and elaborate, but concealed under the inconvenient form of Lectures, sixty in number, and ranging in length from forty to more than three hundred and forty pages each. Neither an index, nor a full table of contents, gives a clew to this great wilderness of thought. Absolutely no division, save of paragraphs and pages, marks to the eye the progress of the argument; and this in a lecture perhaps long enough for an ordinary volume, and making in itself an elaborate treatise of science or history. The style is one which we have heard characterized by a dauntless and universal reader, as the only *unreadable* French he ever saw. It is made up of the steady and continuous flow of sentence after sentence, of discouraging length, without the convenient marks of parenthesis and colon, requiring each a special effort of mind to encounter it, and having no relief except that found in the pregnancy of the thought, and a terseness and pungency of expression amounting at rare intervals to a grim and titanic humor. Add to this, that for the understanding of the earlier portion a special culture is required, and a familiarity with scientific knowledge which belongs to few, and we find reason enough why most persons have contented themselves with remote allusions and sweeping criticisms, rather than undertaken the task of a fair and full review.

The last difficulty in the way of a due appreciation of it, we have by no means been able to surmount: the others we have encountered to the best of our ability. Not to pretend to more than we have been able to accomplish, we shall presently indicate more exactly the character of the several divisions. Before coming to the work itself, we shall say something about the man, his intentions in it, and qualifications for it.

A "personal preface" to the last volume affords most

* See especially Book VI. Chap. X.

of the materials we have for knowing him. "Born," he says, "in the South of our France, [in Montpellier, about the year 1798,] of a family eminently catholic and monarchial, brought up, too, in one of the lyceums in which Bonaparte vainly endeavoured, at great cost, to restore the old mental preponderance of the theologico-metaphysical régime, I had hardly reached my fourteenth year, when, passing of my own accord through all the essential stages of the revolutionary spirit, I already felt the fundamental need of a universal regeneration, both political and philosophical, under the active impulse of the salutary crisis whose principal phases had preceded my birth, and whose irresistible ascendancy was the more sure upon me, that, being fully in harmony with my own temper, it was then suppressed everywhere about me." At the Polytechnic School, he clearly perceived "the need of applying to vital and social speculations the new method of philosophizing which he had learned in regard to the simpler subjects; . . . and the feeling of the true encyclopedical hierarchy began gradually to develop itself in him." The need of the "harmony of intellectual and political tendencies" brought him at one time strongly under the influence of the ill-instructed and illogical enthusiast (as he afterwards regarded him), Henri St. Simon, of whose doctrine he was reputed to be "one of the most fervent disciples."* Being presently dissatisfied with this vague and random turn of thought, he set to thinking more resolutely for himself; and in 1822 made the discovery of his "great fundamental law" of human development, which it thenceforth became his business to expound, illustrate, and apply. This he did in preparatory treatises of his own, and also by essays in sundry journals in 1825-26; † embodying his views, moreover, in a course of lectures about the year 1829, which he afterwards wrote out in this voluminous treatise.

Meanwhile, devoted to a solitary and studious life, he

* *Littérature Française Contemporaine*, in which the notice of Comte is both incomplete and incorrect.

† A short attack of insanity in this latter year (in which he found more to dread from the treatment than the disease) doubtless gave occasion to the vague rumor, that his speculations had terminated in this catastrophe. He recovered from it in due time, thanks to the vigor of his constitution, so as to observe and use it for scientific purposes, and went on with his self-appointed task.

supported himself by mathematical instruction, from as early as 1816. His attainments in this department were eminent and unquestioned. Authority as high as any pronounces him to be the most masterly expounder of the philosophy of mathematics. An inferior position as teacher in the Polytechnic School was grudgingly given him, which he accepted as a relief from the drudgery of his private lessons, and as securing him freedom and opportunity to work. It is needless to detail the discomfort and grievance to which his somewhat surly independence here exposed him, or the story of the jealousy pitifully exhibited, as he complains, in his whole treatment. "In proportion," he says, "as my intellectual position has been clearly defined by the successive appearance of the several volumes of this treatise, an inevitable official decline has not prevented towards me the hostile demonstrations of that incorrigible party, which, feeling itself for five centuries more and more incapable of maintaining any real discussion, still aspires, even in its dotage, to exterminate or revile its various philosophical adversaries. In spite of its usual circumspection, the court of Rome has lately fulminated against a still unfinished work one of those ridiculous censures, which have henceforth lost even the singular power (that still subsisted in the last century) of inducing people to read the works which are the object of them,—towards which the public now does not even deign to inform itself of any such proscription." M. Comte sturdily persisted in his heretical reform; and, as the best primary instruction in his "positive" faith, lectured the public gratuitously on astronomy. So the churchmen actively tried to deprive him of his office; the metaphysical and politician party, in silent jealousy, studiously kept him out of sight; and from the pedantic and narrow-minded men who made the scientific corps, his treatment was not much better. Notwithstanding the honorable regard of a few, whose friendship he proudly claims, and the heartier appreciation of the young men who learned of him, he was effectually shut out from all hope of promotion; and, for any thing we know, the discreditable controversy has been going on to this day.

M. Comte's method of study, he tells us, has been to amass, while he had occasion, all the knowledge he could

bring to bear on the points he had in hand, thus completing at a very early age what must have been a large and thorough course of study; and thereafter, to trust himself wholly to the working of his own mind,—not so much as reading a single periodical journal, or taking note of the thoughts and reasonings of other men, and only posting himself up at intervals with the progress of mathematical knowledge. The material thus gathered and treasured up he gives out rapidly, and almost disdainfully, when the occasion calls; writing only for the press, almost without revision, and resuming, without break or discontinuity, after months or years of interval, his train of thought precisely where he left it off. The work in our hands, extending in its publication over twelve years, and once suspended for five years, is a curious example of completeness, steadiness, and uniformity of design. Towards the close, its proportions expand somewhat, and its tone becomes more confident and earnest; but the form and style of thought have as complete a symmetry as the working of a geometrical theorem. There is even a nice and curious consistency in the undertone of feeling, allusion, and prejudice, very noticeable as one comes to review and revise the work as a whole.

His manner of thinking and writing has its disadvantages as well as gain. The temper of thought becomes over positive and arrogant. Nothing of its harshness is lost by attrition. Prejudice is confirmed, and becomes morbidly consistent and strong. The style suffers for want of the tempering that more care would give,—perhaps from an undue scorn of the rhetoricians and “litterateurs.” Though dense and strong, it is all formed after the same cumbrous and fatiguing model. Unconscious, for want of comparison, how far he agrees or clashes with other minds, he shows often a steadiness of misappreciation, and a systematic injustice, quite unworthy of what we must concede to be the breadth of his thought, and the integrity of his purpose. Nowise insensible to these defects, yet with frank and ample honor for what he has undertaken and done, we will attempt now a more distinct, though brief and cursory, notice of his great work.

Its design is nothing less than *the recasting of the whole system of modern thought and knowledge* (and by

anticipation the social system too), *on the basis given in the method of the natural sciences*. He sets out, in the very first page, with the statement of what he considers his own grand discovery of the fundamental law of human development; namely, "that each branch of our knowledge passes in succession through three different theoretic states, the theological state, the metaphysical or abstract state, and the scientific or positive state." This most convenient generalization of what he shows to be an obvious and undeniable fact in the history of speculation,—appearing to him,* after seventeen years of constant meditation, "as fully demonstrated as any of the general facts at present admitted in the other branches of natural history,"—serves as the key to his whole system. We cannot dwell upon his elaborate exposition of it in the two introductory lectures, but must content ourselves with the simple statement. It seems to express, clearly and unexceptionably enough, the transition (which necessarily takes place in the mind of a thinking man *au niveau du siècle*, and which is exhibited on a great scale in the mental history of the race) from the wandering and imaginative state which invests every thing with life, and regards all things as the direct exercise of volitions kindred with our own, to that condition of calm observation and reasoning, which investigates phenomena and "their invariable relations of succession and similitude," and makes science possible. Metaphysics is a middle state, dealing in "intermediate conceptions of a bastard character,"—one of vague abstractions and barren jargonizing. The other two are the natural and healthy extremes of mental development,—the right beginning and the inevitable term.

The peculiarity of M. Comte's view is, that he carries this maxim or generalization with unvarying and inexorable steadiness through every department of thought and life. He prefixes to his treatise a tabular view of the objects of human knowledge, dividing them into six grand classes. These are ranged in the order in which they pass through the preparatory stages, and arrive at the final or positive state. Thus the simpler and more general will come first; the more special and complicated last. It is the distinguishing feature, the peculiar boast,

* See Vol IV. p. 655.

of his treatise, that, by dealing with "Social Physics" as a special science, having its own methods, and guiding to its own results, he has filled the gap that remained too long open, and completed definitely and for ever the circle of the sciences; so that henceforth there will be nothing to do but to follow out, strictly and legitimately, the true scientific method in every thing. The others will henceforth have "only an historical existence."

His hierarchy (or ascending series) of the sciences, consists accordingly of the several departments of Mathematics (abstract and concrete), Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, Biology (including the study of the "intellectual and moral, or cerebral functions"), and, lastly, Sociology, which is the crown and completion of the whole. The first two may be considered as having fully arrived at the positive state. No one thinks of going behind a rule in mathematics, or a law in astronomy. Each is simply and only the expression of a fact, which no one pretends to question or define. Yet it is evident that each of these had its "theological state" at starting. The mystic properties of numbers were firmly believed in once. Pythagoras preceded Plato. A tinge of superstition lingers even now in the popular mind, as to lucky numbers and lucky days; as if the numerical figure had some secret power and a will of its own.* But the busy Greeks dispersed that mist, and put thinking men, by their arithmetic and geometry, on the track of true science. Astronomy lingered more than a thousand years behind; and the dreams of the astrologists, which serve now to point a jest, or hoax the vulgar, were serious and sublime realities to an earlier age, and only slowly yielded before the unsparing calculus of Kepler and Newton. In the process and the effective work of the strict sciences, we know nothing of secret powers and unseen agencies; we deal only with the fact. Science is equivalent here to prescience. To know is to foreknow. And we deal with the future fact as easily and certainly as we deal with the present and the past. †

* We suggest this illustration, as a suitable filling out of the author's idea. So far as we remember, he does not indicate that the science of numbers ever passed through the "theological" period.

† Astronomy he regards as especially antagonistic to theology, "precisely because it is *more a science* than any other": it dispels the superstitions which, without its cultivation, would presently return. Vol. II. pp. 35, 36. "Foresight of a providential event would be sacrilege." Vol. IV. p. 314.

The progress of thought which we see so clearly in these cases is slowly going on in each of the successive departments already named. We know the confused and crude conceptions which have beset such matters as electricity, heat, and light, and the whole range of Physics, except the laws of weight alone, which we are content from the beginning to take as simple fact.* Numberless attempts have been made, for example, to explain scientifically, not the laws of the simple phenomenon, *light or heat*, but the motions of an imaginary emanation or ether, supposed to convey the same; and electricity and magnetism are bewildered, to this day, with doctrines of imponderable fluids, their circulations and their antagonisms.† All these are relics of the metaphysical stage, which supervened upon the theological,—which came in vogue when the special divinities of polytheism were unseated, and all things were held tributary to a Universal Will. To be aware that we are on a wrong track, is a token that we are about to change our course. More recent investigations (especially those of Fourier with regard to heat) are putting the doctrines of Physics in less exceptionable shape. This department, accordingly, is in the transition state, from the metaphysical to the positive stage.

In the next class, we find far more of vagueness, and feebler approaches as yet to a true scientific apprehension. Chemistry is hitherto “not science, but erudition,”—a gathering of facts, with uncertain theories of their connection, but without the positive and clear notion of their real character; with more obstinate habits of referring them to imaginary agencies, with more obtrusive relics of the old metaphysic doctrine of “entities.” And still more perplexing and perplexed do we find that class of chemical relations, which mark the obscure boundary between organic and inorganic existence.‡ Chemistry proper,

* Polytheism, nay, Fetichism itself, had a germ of positivity; since there was never accounted to be a god of weight. Vol. IV. p. 694.

† Franklin had “irrevocably destroyed, even in the least cultivated minds, the religious theory of thunder.” Vol. II. p. 427.

‡ Our author thinks there is no “reason to suppose the most complicated phenomena of living bodies to be essentially of a different nature from the simplest inorganic” (*corps bruts*). Vol. I. p. 89. Also, that all bodies are naturally and spontaneously active in certain ways; a purely passive state is “a veritable absurdity.” Ibid. p. 551.

with its doctrine of equivalents or definite proportions, is compact and clear, beside those inextricable, fluctuating, and undeterminable combinations, which mark the chemical conditions of organic life.

It would be quite hopeless to go in the regular way through the whole series of the sciences, till we come to the "positive" condition of them all, and so arrive in due course at the purely scientific stage of those which are vastly more complex and comprehensive than all the rest, — the phenomena of the human mind and of human society, now abandoned almost wholly to the old influence of metaphysics and theology. It is time, therefore, thinks our author, to *take for granted* his fundamental law, and apply it by anticipation to the topics which remain. Intellectual and moral philosophy (at least their essential rudiments in the human constitution, leaving their full development for his final science, Sociology) are accordingly despatched summarily, in a discourse of Biology. Among many lucid and happy suggestions as to the essential conditions of vegetable and animal life, thought and emotion are treated simply as functions of the brain. Gall is duly honored for having opened the way to regarding the study of the mind as a positive science;* the method of the psychologists is elaborately set at naught, and the essential doctrine of phrenology is accepted, not without a side-stroke at its sciolist expounders.† Mill very justly censures this rapid and summary merging of all mental study into the mere working of the brain and nerves, — certainly quite as difficult to observe as some of the plainer laws and processes of the human understanding.‡ It is needless to add, that our author regards the human and brute mind as essentially the same; considers that a cat has as distinct a sense of personality as a man; and scorns the use of such a term as *soul*, as any other metaphysical "entity" or imaginary fluid.§ It will be obvious that

* "You are to *abstract* your mind, i. e. watch its operations when there is nothing going on: this will doubtless be all stage-play to our descendants." Vol. I. p. 36; also, Vol. III. p. 457.

† Vol. III. p. 824.

‡ "Logic," Book VI. Chap. 4, § 2.

§ Vol. II. p. 447. The term "reasoning animal" is nonsense; all animals must reason; they use reason as men do (if we observe them as we might "men of speech and manners previously unknown"), to satisfy organic

the topics of intellectual philosophy thus rapidly touched upon, (towards which he seems to show a lack of courtesy, to say the least, best explained as a relic of his old quarrel with the metaphysicians,) are reserved for more deliberate handling, when he comes to regard them in their proper place, among social phenomena.

The three volumes thus cursorily noticed are, as we have said, simply introductory. They contain many admirable views (if they may not be called treatises), critical and historical, of the special sciences, and furnish probably the most able and complete exposition to be found of their several processes and results. Still, his province hitherto is mainly critical and expository, rather than constructive. He is laboring, so to speak, in other men's fields. Henceforth, the ground he is to occupy is his own. He enters upon it in a masterly manner, and works in it, to do him justice, with a steady step, a thorough oversight, and a strong and skilful hand. Once allow for the speciality of his position, and the whole becomes eminently instructive and valuable. Hardly a page or a line is without its fertile suggestion, and its traces of close and profound thought. He proposes in his way to answer the whole great problem that weighs upon the mind and destiny of Europe: and he addresses himself to the task with all the gravity, earnestness, and concentrated strength, which become a man feeling himself as it were alone, and speaking on so transcendently great a matter. And, still to do him justice, there is an apparent good faith, a strong sense of morality, a humanity amounting at times to tenderness,* a force of conviction that, though he may not be heard now, he is yet saying what men must some time listen to, and what they will

wants, and language (of a sort) in accordance thereto. They exercise their faculties, for the simple satisfaction of doing it; "invent new games, like children and savages"; are subject to *ennui*;—"that state which has been falsely made a privilege of human nature is sometimes so decided among certain animals, as to drive them to suicide, in consequence of captivity which has grown intolerable." Vol. III. pp. 785, 786. He doubts whether there be any exclusively human faculty, "if we compare without prejudice the acts of the highest Mammiferæ with those of the least developed savages"; we view them too much on a level, as a despot views his subjects; and human social progress is gained partly by suppressing their progressive faculty. *Ibid.*, pp. 832, 833. Animals, moreover, "arrive spontaneously at a sort of rude fetichism." Vol. V. p. 36. See, in general, Lect. XLV., on "Intellectual and Moral, or Cerebral, Functions." Vol. III. pp. 763-845.

* See for example, as to treatment of animals, Vol. III. p. 326, and Vol. IV. p. 440.

be inevitably compelled to accept and apply,— which put him in most favorable comparison with any purely *ethical* writer whom we know. For breadth and minuteness of view, no statement is superior to his of the condition of things under which he writes. For largeness of intellectual grasp, and steadiness of conception and development, we know not where to find any thing more impressive than his statement of the whole intellectual and social problem, as gradually unfolded and brought down to us, by the entire course of the history of mankind.

His object, as he avows it,* is, “the resolution of our intellectual anarchy, the real origin, first of moral, and then of political anarchy.” This condition is the “result of the always increasing decline of the theologico-metaphysical philosophy (which has come in our day to a powerless decrepitude), and the continual, but still incomplete, development of the positive philosophy, hitherto too narrow, special, and timid to possess itself of the spiritual government of humanity.” † It is absurd at the present day to go back, for the support of social order, to “a political system which has not been so much as able to support itself before the natural progress of mind and society.” To talk of submitting reason to faith,— the last refuge of theologians, — when reason itself must be the judge of such submission, ‡ is only to expose still further the hopelessness of that attempt. The retrograde party, represented by the Roman Church, is divided against itself. In Ireland it demands freedom of conscience as against the government; in Spain it denies and scouts the same. The system is fallen into inevitable decline; it has “ratified its own political degradation”; and the order it once established is for ever lost.

Nor is the metaphysical party in much better case. With its theory of antagonism between government and people, with its fictitious hostilities and balancings of powers in the state, with its crude doctrine of unlimited freedom of opinion,— a doctrine nowhere practically allowed,— and its religious conviction degenerated to “that vague and impotent theism which, by a monstrous

* Vol. IV. p. 4.

† Ibid. p. 8. He acquits the several parties, by the way, of any evil intent, which, he says (p. 16), “especially in politics, is eminently exceptional.”

‡ Ibid. p. 25.

combination of terms, it calls natural religion," — it has fulfilled, at best, a transitional function, and its vital force is spent. Some ephemeral sects have "preached, as the final term of social perfection, a sort of reestablishment of the Egyptian or Hebrew theocracy, founded on a genuine fetichism, vainly dissembled under the name of Pantheism."* The immense power of Bonaparte was squandered "in the vain restoration of the military and theologic system." The framers of those "transitory compromises" called constitutions have (at least in France) succeeded no better. There is a chaos of conflicting opinions on every subject. Hence such vagaries as are now afloat relative to the disuse of money, the destruction of great cities as harmful to the public welfare, the equalizing of wages, or setting a maximum thereto, and the absolute abolition of capital punishment "in the name of a vain metaphysical assimilation of the most worthless scoundrels to the simply diseased." Morality in public life is as good as extinct; and in private life is in peril. The whole political world is given over to the reign of "charlatanism and mediocrity." All the hopes of the retrograde party are destined to be extinguished by successive revolutions. And the men of science, who have in their philosophic method the only key to the solution of the problem, are utterly indifferent to the whole question of social progress.†

Such is the dreary picture which M. Comte gives of the intellectual condition and political hope of modern Europe. The need and sufficiency of the style of thought he advocates come next in view. It is contradistinguished from the former philosophies by the preponderance of reason and observation over imagination and abstract argument, as to method, and by renouncing "the search for absolute notions," as to doctrine, — the precise reverse of the two former school methods of thinking.‡ In other words, it corresponds to a more highly developed condition of the human intellect. There is doubtless real progress, — improvement of men's *condition* and their *faculties*. This, however, affects not the question of the comparative happiness of different ages. Social phenom-

* Vol. IV. p. 75; Vol. V. p. 42.

† See the whole of Lecture XLVI., Vol. IV. pp. 1-224.

‡ Vol. IV. p. 293. See also Vol. VI. pp. 701, 721.

ena are the most complex, and hence the most imperfectly regulated and most easily modified of all. *Each social system is the best which the conditions admit.* Alter the conditions (intellectual and moral) and the way is open for all degrees of social improvement.*

Here follows the exposition of his doctrine of human society, — divided again (to borrow terms from mechanics, as might equally well be done from any other science, as music) into the two grand departments of social Statics and Dynamics. † With the first, essential and valuable in its place, we have nothing now to do. It is his development of the fundamental law of social evolution which chiefly interests us. It corresponds in a loose and general way, stage by stage, with the intellectual evolution before described. ‡ The three great periods of history are sufficiently characterized as corresponding to the theologic, the metaphysic, and the positive state of the human mind.

The first development of society is essentially religious. "The admirable spontaneity of the theological philosophy breaks the vicious circle," and gives suitable subjects of contemplation and a stimulus of action.§ Miracle and prayer ("that remarkable condition spontaneously produced in the entire human brain by this important phenomenon, at once intellectual and moral") necessarily attend upon the first steps of human evolution. || Society is organized under the auspices of a priesthood, — the intellectual class. Without it, man would have remained "little above the apes." Its function is at best provisional. It becomes the needful and effective agency, for want of better. And the earliest form of human society is at once theocratic and military, — a double contrast to

* Vol. IV. pp. 387, 395.

† Static and Dynamic, "as fitted to act, and as really acting," — definition borrowed from Blainville. See Vol. I. p. 33.

‡ Vol. IV. p. 735. "The fundamental type of human evolution, as well individual as collective, is found in the increasing preponderance of our *humanity* over our *animality*"; and in particular, of the intellect over the propensities, and of the sympathetic instinct over the personal. Vol. VI. p. 837.

§ It is needful, "as the rallying-point and food of mental activity." Questions the most radically inaccessible are precisely those first attempted, while those really solvable are scorned. The mind in its infancy needs the stimulus of "those chimerical hopes, those exaggerated ideas of the importance of man in the universe, which give birth to the theological philosophy." Vol. I. p. 10; also, Vol. V. p. 72.

|| Vol. IV. p. 673. Add to this the needful agency of *enasi*. Vol. III. p. 754.

its final condition, which we are approaching now, as scientific and industrial.

The successive stages are next elaborately detailed, as a parallel and illustration of his fundamental law. The theological order of society has three well-marked periods, fetichistic, polytheistic, and monotheistic. The first is shown in the spontaneous and rude life of savages; the next, in the advancing civilization of Egypt, Greece, and Rome; and the last, in the social rule and order of the Catholic system of the Middle Age.*

We pass reluctantly over that portion of the work † containing the strikingly original and profound discussion of the earlier stages of religious development. The true representative of monotheism is in the Catholic system of the mediæval Church, with its eminent social vigor, and its singular efficacy as a political power. Here is precisely the point of advantage in this, as compared with the other two. The agency of the Roman hierarchy in constructing the fabric of European civilization is most satisfactorily shown. Its capital characteristic, as distinguished from earlier systems, was the *separation of the temporal and spiritual powers*, which the intellectual strength of antiquity was vainly spent in the endeavour to combine. ‡ Hence the possibility of a system uniting so various nations and manners; and the magnificent compass of that embrace which as easily took in the new continent of America, as upheld the old organization of Europe. Its inherent weakness and insufficiency (which, on the other hand, lost to it from the first Byzantium and the East) were not from fault in the organization, but from the defect of the fundamental idea,—from the “vague and arbitrary character of theological beliefs.” While the doctrine was held with firm conviction, its social office was abundantly fulfilled. In its conflict with the political power, it stood strictly on the defensive.

* To judge then fairly, he says, we should “almost indifferently transfer our thoughts to all degrees of the theological scale, without any disturbing predilection.” Vol. V. p. 52. This, of course, can only be done by that school, which is “equally disengaged from monotheistic beliefs as from polytheistic or fetichistic” (Ibid. p. 325); viz. by the “positive” school, of which, he somewhere takes occasion to tell us, he is at present the sole representative.

† Lectures LII. and LIII., Vol. V. pp. 1–296.

‡ The defeat of Arianism, as the state party, is, we suppose, to be regarded as the vindication of this essential idea of Catholic Christianity.

This, too, was the character of the great religious wars waged under its auspices: the Crusades were neither aggressive, nor without success.* Its doctrine and discipline were by no means arbitrary, but essential to its efficiency. Hence we must justify its institution of celibacy and confession, its claim of local sovereignty (though at the temporary political sacrifice of Italy), the "fundamental dose of Polytheism" which it was obliged to retain, and the dogmas of original sin and exclusive salvation in its doctrinal system,—though, indeed, "the obligation to damn Homer, Aristotle, Archimedes, etc., must surely have been very painful to all Catholic philosophers; still, it was strictly necessitated by the imperfect nature of the system." † Faith became the first of duties, and the basis of all morality. ‡ And nobly, in the emancipation of the class of slaves, in the conduct of general education "by those modest masterpieces of common philosophy which made up the substance of the vulgar catechism," in its assiduous culture of domestic morals, and in the steady development of modern industry, did the Church vindicate its title to the spiritual direction of mankind. §

Catholicism occupied ten centuries—from Paul to Hildebrand—in its doctrinal and ecclesiastical development; it continued in full vigor for less than two. Its decline dates from the beginning of the fourteenth century. The function of a priesthood, including the active administration of social rule, can never engage the highest intellects as a class. There is an essential want of harmony and sympathy between such minds and the personal interests and small details which occupy the governing order. In the period of its healthy and normal activity, the Church adopted and fostered the intellectual culture of the age, and by a wise policy secured to itself that adventitious influence which comes of the popular respect for mind. But it had fatally committed itself to dogmas and decrees having their fitness only for the past, which the human reason must soon outgrow. Rising heresies it put down at first with a strong hand, and easily; then came the period of tyranny and spasmodic

* Vol. V. p. 404.

‡ Ibid. p. 378.

† Ibid. p. 440.

§ Lecture LIV., Vol. V. pp. 297–491.

effort; and the mendicant orders of preachers came forward to turn the current of men's thought, and get up a counter excitement, and deprive heresy of its breath.* But the culture which the Church had nurtured became too large for its compass. Scholasticism and the universities first undermined the intellectual basis of its supremacy.† Metaphysical adroitness and ethical casuistry managed to disguise the appearance of dissent; and with prodigious effort the elements of future dissolution were retained in nominal allegiance. But perpetual compromise did its work. The Church found its lofty function gradually reduced to the task of self-preservation and the office of preaching. It had lost the prestige of intellectual superiority, and with it that grand power of organization and centralization, as extended once over the "European Synergy" of states. Henceforth the several state-monarchies retained whatever of that organic force was left.‡ And these contained the elements of their own decline: for when the political power of the Popes became a shadow, and their consecration was no longer of any account, the royalty in turn was undermined by its own victory, and lost its hold on the religious reverence of the people. The phrase "Catholic Majesty" remained; but the thing it signified was rapidly passing away.§

So passed the first great period of the disorganization of the mediæval system, — while the Church still retained its outward unity, and the elements of its dissolution were within. With the sixteenth century began a new period. A revolutionary spirit was at work in every Catholic country, — in some leading to open secession, in others working more secretly, to this day. The three centuries which followed have been a period of rapid and visible decomposition. Luther, Calvin, and Socinus represent the protest made respectively against the discipline, the hierarchy, and the doctrine of the Church: the third marks the transition from the theological to the deistic epoch. The prestige and authority of the Church were gone. Its active energies were wielded by the voluntary association of the Jesuits; which declined to the lamentable condition of "a sort of universal mystification,

* Vol. V. p. 510.
‡ Ibid. p. 578.

† Ibid. p. 555.
§ Ibid. p. 569.

in which each should be at once, and for the same purpose, both cheat and dupe." So the spiritual power changed hands, and lost respect. Catholicism became servile, and deserted its former noble mission, to vindicate the popular liberty and right.* The grand organization of Christianity degenerated into "that multitude of heterogeneous sects, of which each held the one before it in pity, and the one after it in abhorrence, according to the greater or less decomposition of their theological system.†" Hence, in Protestant countries especially, an affected horror of spiritual power, an unjust scorn of the Middle Ages, and an absurd admiration of polytheistic antiquity. Hence, too, a growth of more dangerous sophisms and fallacies: the idea that social wants are to be met by mere change of laws; the tendency to a "metaphysical theocracy," in the "reign of virtue," which would be nothing but the inauguration of cant; the selfish and benevolent schools of ethics, — respectively "ignorant cynicism" and "systematized hypocrisy"; vain reverence for the "metaphysical abstraction of Law," made up of "a chaos of judicial decisions"; the subjection of the spiritual to the temporal power, — religion, education, and morals being (especially in Protestant countries) under the patronage of the ruling class; the depravation of moral taste, as seen in the "Pucelle" of Voltaire and the "Confessions" of Rousseau; and the final stage of Atheism, with its crowning abstraction of "Nature," its vague worship of "a goddess instead of a God," and its complete dissolution of the fabric of men's thought and morals, — a dissolution which the Church was utterly powerless to prevent.‡

Meanwhile, a "unanimous, instinctive movement of reorganization," dating as far back as the formation of the European system under Charlemagne, continued in the emancipation of labor under the auspices of the Church, and receiving its final stimulus from the great inventions and discoveries of the fifteenth century, § had developed in ample shape and proportion the reconstructive agencies of society. Its evolution had gone hand in hand with the earlier steps of positive science. Albertus

* Vol. V. p. 567; Vol. VI. p. 133.

† Vol. V. pp. 661 and 693.

‡ Lecture LV., Vol. V. pp. 492-775.

§ Vol. V. pp. 411, 467, and Vol. VI. pp. 46, 104.

Magnus, Roger Bacon, Galileo, Copernicus, and Newton represent the several stages of that evolution. A "sort of new faith" in scientific methods and principles sprang up, taking the place, by degrees, in men's minds, of their waning theological belief. The essential integrity of the human mind was admirably shown in "the universal adoption of the twofold motion of the earth, a century before the Papacy, by a needless inconsistency, had at last solemnly tolerated its Christian admissibility." Herein was involved greater intellectual revolution than in any other single step of mental progress. "A doctrine as old as our mind, directly established on the strongest testimony of the most constant phenomena, intimately bound up with the whole system of ruling opinions and the general interest of existing powers, one to which the pride of man lent an instinctive support in the secret of each individual consciousness,"* was peaceably overthrown; and the supremacy of science in the realm of thought was definitely established. The great controversy of Nominalist and Realist was "the inevitable struggle of the positive spirit against the metaphysical"; as the so-called science of Natural Theology had exhibited "the contradictory dualism then established [by the schoolmen] between the old idea of God and the new entity of Nature,—the respective centres of the theological and metaphysical philosophy."† Society and politics, too, became the subject of philosophic discussion, though as yet only in a provisional way, and by means of a "dispersive empiricism."‡ Labor began to be more completely organized. Machinery superseded a large portion of human toil; and the condition of the popular masses grew to be the great political problem of modern times. "Throughout the great European commonwealth, the happy preliminary development of the new social element has constituted, since the Middle Age, a universal movement of partial recomposition, destined to concur with the simultaneous movement of political decomposition, so as, by their inevitable combination, to give birth to the final regeneration of humanity."§

But the destructive and reproductive agencies accom-

* Vol. II. p. 171.

† Vol. VI. pp. 315, 328.

‡ Vol. VI. p. 91.

§ Lecture LVI., Vol. VI. pp. 1 - 343.

panied each other with unequal steps. The old system hastened to its fall; the new came but slowly to take its place. Hence that great revolutionary crisis, wherein "a deliberate experiment should display the organic impotence of the *critical* principle, which had presided in the decomposition of the old system."* Its premonitory symptoms were, the abolition of the Order of Jesuits, the financial reforms of Turgot, and the American Revolution. Destitute alike of doctrine and purpose, conceiving of society "as indefinitely abandoned, without any independent impulse of its own, to the interminable succession of vain constitutional essays," the negative and critical philosophy, represented by pedantic and legal formalists, assumed the empire of misrule. "The audacious legal suppression of Christianity signally displayed both the caducity of an organization which had at last become essentially foreign to modern life, and the need of a new spiritual order capable of directing fitly the regeneration of humanity." The strenuous and apt policy of the "Convention" saved France from the imminent peril (induced by the guilty incapability of the Girondist party) of being severed into petty states.† The fall of Robespierre was "the first decisive symptom of the inevitable decline of a disastrous policy, which, in spite of the most horrid excesses of exceptional proceedings, could succeed only in organizing a complete retrogradation." With him, however, (representing the *deistical* or *religious* party of the revolutionists,) had begun a reaction, which was continued in the "reestablishment of monarchy, under a vain imperial disguise," by Bonaparte, — "a man almost an alien to France, coming from a backward state of civilization, and especially animated, under the secret impulse of a superstitious temperament, by an involuntary admiration of the old social hierarchy; while the measureless ambition which devoured him was really, notwithstanding his vast characteristic charlatanism, associated with no eminent mental superiority, except what is found in his undeniable talent for war, much more akin, especially in our day, with moral energy, than with intellectual

* Vol. VI. p. 346. It was the fulfilment of the political dream of the Greek philosophers. See Vol. V. p. 263.

† Vol. VI. p. 376.

force.* Then came the restoration of monarchy, with no nobler pretension than to keep the peace; the professed government of interests, so different from the revolutionary heroism; the rise of journalism; the increasing decline of the Church, its ranks "more and more recruited among inferior natures"; the immense military police, or standing army; and, along with a new industrial development, the greater imminency of the social problem, and the greater need of reconstruction.†

What is needed now is the due combination of elements already existing. No true "spiritual power" is at present recognized. To rehabilitate the old Catholicism is utterly out of the question. Perpetual controversy has consumed the vitality and social efficiency of religious beliefs. A political solution of the difficulty is no solution at all. The true foundation of authority must be "the confidence spontaneously reposed in intellectual and moral superiority." All that prevents the scientific world from occupying the noble position of leading in the social regeneration is the want of decision and breadth of view among those who constitute it. The difficulty it may find will be from within; as with Hildebrand, in his construction of the Catholic system. ‡ But there is every need that the effort should be made; and that henceforth the conduct of education and the welfare of the laboring orders (now abandoned by "the Church") should be assumed as the especial charge and commission of science. Its special office is, "to carry good common sense into every subject accessible to human reason." A direction should be given to the popular demands, moral rather than political. The stewardship of wealth, the right to education and employment, are to be enforced. And this new spiritual power, which must needs gain the popular allegiance and assent, will speedily have to interfere, to reconcile dissensions that might be fatal. The following is the language in which M. Comte heralds, six years in advance, the recent shocks in the European system: —

"In the painful collisions, inevitably preparing for us through the existing anarchy, under the ready excitement of hateful passions and subversive social dreams (*utopies*), the true philoso-

* Vol. VI. p. 386.

† Vol. VI. pp. 344-469.

‡ Vol. VI. p. 453.

phers, who shall have foreseen them, will be already prepared duly to derive from them the great social lessons which they should offer to all; thus showing to either side the inevitable insufficiency of purely political measures for the true end they respectively have in view, — the one as to progress, the other as to order, — the common realization of which must now depend on a total reorganization, first and above all *spiritual* [intellectual and moral]. The fatal infirmity of our nature, intellectual or affective, obliges us perhaps to regard these unhappy conflicts as alone able to compel upon all, and chiefly the class in power, a conviction so indispensable, and yet so opposed by all the habits and inclinations now prevalent. We may at least affirm, that, if these storms can really be averted, it can only be by means of a vast systematic development of the true philosophical action, whose social advent is, on the contrary, blindly repulsed in our day by statesmen of all parties. Bonaparte miserably let go the happiest possible occasion of thus preparing for the future: it is scarce likely that there will arise hereafter any temporal power, personal or collective, competent to repair in this regard that stupendous error, which history doubtless will one day deplore, as most fatal to the whole modern evolution." — Vol. VI. p. 612.

To sum up rapidly the conclusion of this longest and perhaps most important chapter of his work: he vindicates the "new power" as effectual for the cause of order; claims its agency as superseding the old system of education; exhibits its points of contact and alliance with the several existing parties; and, after a digression on the study of "less advanced populations," proceeds to show the various degrees of preparation for the final reconstruction in the several European nations.* And, finally, as a first practical measure towards this end, he suggests the forming of an association, to be entitled the "Positive Committee of the West," — which would, doubtless, in course of time, lead to the establishment of a true international power. †

The remainder of the work, consisting of three closing lectures, is occupied with a more special exposition of the "positive" or scientific method as applying to the questions thus laid open, together with an elaborate comparison

* The order of their aptness for the "positive" condition is, 1. France, 2. Italy, 3. Germany, 4. England, and lastly, Spain. It is worthy of remark, that he regards the Catholic countries as more fully prepared for a general disavowal of all religion. Vol. VI. p. 631 *et seq.*

† Lecture LVII. Vol. VI. pp. 344 – 644.

of this with other methods, as to each particular point of application.* To notice this portion adequately would take up at least the limits of another article. We are happy in being spared that task, and in being able to refer our readers to the independent, yet consentaneous, elaboration of the same subject by Mill, in the closing chapters of his *Logic*.

The peculiar form of his negation of religious beliefs is that, we apprehend, by which M. Comte has been chiefly, if not altogether, known among the larger class of readers. Without concealing this, it has at the same time been our purpose to state his method and system as a whole, so as to give his special opinions that degree of perspective and relief which they have in his own mind. A position which exposes him to the virulent hostility of every known party should be examined (when held by an able and sincere man) with peculiar caution, and a desire to be scrupulously just. It is quite evident that he is not to be confounded in the charge of vulgar atheism; and that the commonplaces of natural theology are of very little service in considering his argument. It is evident, too, that he has elaborately studied and carefully weighed the *historical* significance of each principal phasis of theological opinion; and has sought, in his own fashion, to do ample justice to them all. And we think it will be allowed by those who have examined his work, that, for the clearness of appreciation with which he discerns the religious element in the forming period of human society, and for the breadth of vision and fertility of suggestion with which he surveys and describes the field of religious and philosophical history, he has no superior. No Catholic writer, not even Count de Maistre, has more ably set forth the constructive function of the Church; no man, not even Benjamin Constant, has more fully and justly represented the working of the religious element in the primitive era of the human race.

What, then, is the whole drift and tendency of his philosophy? To this we answer, that we have honestly

* As supplementary labors, M. Comte announces the following: — 1. *Philosophy of Mathematics*, 2 vols.; 2. *System of Social Philosophy*, 4 vols.; 3. *True Method of Positive Education*, 1 vol.; 4. *Action of Man upon the Natural World*, 1 vol. We are unaware that either of these projected works has yet been published.

surrendered ourself to his influence, and weighed each suggestion that he has made, for the sake of testing, fairly as we might, the force he brought to bear. There is, doubtless, a widening and deepening and shifting of the perspective; but, as respects the essential elements of religious conviction, we do not find them altered or diminished. The fact is, the range of his argument, and the bearing of his thought, are mainly aside from what we have been accustomed to regard with most interest as our peculiar "theological" domain. So that his arguments, if so they may be called, aimed at religious ideas themselves, or the objects of them, simply "pass by us as the idle wind, which we regard not." We can accept in good faith his immense services, in the way of historical and scientific criticism, and social philosophy, without being in the least disturbed by the fact that he is an "infidel," and that he ignores utterly what to us is sacred and cherished truth. We will state more explicitly what we mean.

In the first place, it is the *social* application and efficacy of the religious idea, which alone concerns his philosophic view; i. e. his first business is to discard a theological basis for the reconstruction of the social system. Thus, in what is the real drift and essential application of his doctrine, we have no quarrel with him; for it is only the position which our national constitution (as opposed to the British) has sanctioned, and which the American people, Catholics and all, have ratified with one accord.

In the next place, as long as his philosophy is true to its legitimate function, it does not invade directly the province of religious faith. With the private opinions of M. Comte the non-believer in Christianity, or in any religion at all, we have simply nothing to do: in his philosophy, as expounder of science, history, and society, we can take unalloyed satisfaction, quite independent of those opinions. For his system, it will be observed, is essentially *negative*, not *privative*, as to religious ideas. It *ignores*, but on its own principles it cannot *deny*. He repudiates the name atheist or materialist as distinctly,* as he would that of religionist disdainfully. If he de-

* Vol. V. p. 539, note; also, Vol. VI. p. 846.

clares to be "absolutely inaccessible and void of sense for us the investigation of what are called *causes*, original or final," we certainly are not bound to trouble ourselves about "the cause of this defect," or to account for the mental idiosyncrasy. As to the proposition that *there is no God*—i. e. no shaping and governing Intellect, no wise forethought, no parental care—in the universe, we cannot possibly put it in such shape that it should ever present a question to be discussed. Utterly perplexed and embarrassed at finding such a mind as Comte's preferring to consider every subject *as if there were no God*, and even engaged in special pleading here and there to refute the ideas which connect themselves with the belief in a Deity (for which he considers that the idea of Humanity is a more than ample substitute),* we can only think that there is perhaps something hopelessly at fault in the statement of the question,—possibly, in every statement of it that can be made by the human mind. What interests us, therefore, is not to answer set arguments, for of these he offers none; but to conjecture, if we can, what the state of mind may be which chooses negation before belief. The influences which may have set that way, we think have been sufficiently indicated in the foregoing pages.

Still further: an admission, of the utmost moment as it seems to us, is made by him perpetually, in the very substitutes he offers from time to time, to supersede our religious notions. Thus he considers that the science of Astronomy has substituted for the old doctrine of final causes the conception of *conditions of existence*, "whose scope and fruitfulness are far superior."† He is also at pains to explain facts seemingly exceptional into conformity with the true law of human development, so as to prove the existence of more goodness and wisdom in the universe than we had supposed. He insists that human society is by the same fundamental law in every case the best that the conditions will admit;‡ and cer-

* Vol. VI. p. 691.

† Vol. II. p. 40. Also, p. 172. "For the fantastic and enervating idea of a universe arranged for man, we substitute the real and living conception of man, discovering by positive exercise of his intellect the true general laws of the world." Also, Vol. III. p. 460.

‡ Vol. IV. p. 387; also, *Ibid.* pp. 196, 587.

tainly implies some corresponding thought, in each instance where he employs his favorite phrase. It is almost needless to say, that it is precisely this tendency, this effort, this vitality, this seizing on every occasion to secure the most favorable result, which to us is the agency of Providence, and the beneficent power of God. To the theist doctrine, as to that of negation, there is the sphere of metaphysical necessity: only to the one it represents a holy Will; to the other, a bare, immutable Fact. But when the Fact becomes a Law, a Tendency, a conscious Purpose, and a Life, then to us it necessarily becomes Divine.* On the whole, as the basis of a religious conception, we like the phrase "conditions of existence" decidedly better than the older and narrower one.

The simple fact is, that M. Comte ought to have restricted himself to his legitimate office, which is, to expound the true function and place of science, and the strictly scientific or social bearings of religious opinions. A theological opinion may be irrelevant, or obscure, or doubtful, or feebly held, or inconsistently stated, or violently contested; and for any or all these reasons, it may be unfit to serve as a basis for political combinations, and so to play a part in the future social evolution of mankind. So far he has a right to go; but no farther. The office of science is to expound to us the laws of that metaphysical necessity of which we spoke. As he well says,† it seeks "not causes, but relations"; it is "the statement of law, not of facts." So far forth as science, it doubtless has nothing to do with the religious interpretation of the law. In its processes, it must deal with facts strictly as if there were nothing beyond. It must "know,

* We are sorry to be obliged to notice, in this connection, the weakness and futility of the direct attempts of M. Comte to assail the religious admiration with which unsophisticated men regard the adaptations of the outward world, and the provisions of natural life. Thus (Vol. II. p. 37) he is at pains to disparage the arrangement of the solar system, apparently for no reason at all. So also (Vol. III. pp. 462, 729) he assures us that the functions of the eye, the bladder, and the motive apparatus are not quite what they should be: and again (Vol. VI. p. 881), that artificial works are in their way decidedly better than the natural. We will just mention, also, in this place, his allusion to the resigned and cheerful suicide of Condorcet (Vol. IV. p. 262), as an example of resignation quite equal to any of the boasts of Christian endurance. It is to be observed, by the way, that no allusion is made to the theological argument from comparative anatomy in its connection with paleontology, and that the latter science is not recognized at all.

† Vol. VI. pp. 701, 703.

in order to foreknow"; it must shift the conditions, so as to watch the change wrought in the result. To foresee or control the phenomena, M. Comte thinks, is destructive of any religious understanding of them. What sort of Divine agency would he have? Should Providence act capriciously? * If the necessity is in the direction of wisdom and goodness (as he contends), it is so far an extension of our religious conception, and a progress in our idea of God. But with the previous opinion, that the Necessity is the Life or Will or Agency of Deity, there is nothing in the range of his lawful science which can come near to damage it.

And still further, let us consider that enlargement of the domain of law, which it is the especial purpose of this treatise to expound. It signifies, simply, that the same sovereignty is over men and nations as over things. Behind the strifes and crimes and calamities and revolutions of mankind, there is a region of fixed and immutable Necessity. This it is, which to us is the purpose or will of God. The grand general features of the world's history, taken in the mass, are the steps and indications of that sovereign Will. The law is not mechanical, but dynamic and vital. It works by living forces,—by creative and reproductive energies. When we submit ourselves in the last resort to its necessity, it is to a law of the same sort as that which the planets obey in their courses, the moon in her monthly round, the ocean's tidal swell, and the ripening fields of grain. It is to be taken for granted in what we think and do, just as the earth's revolution is allowed for in our observations of a planet's path; and no more than the general law of growth interferes with the special development of a plant after its kind, does this sovereign Necessity interfere with the free personality and moral liberty of man.† It marks out a plan or a pattern on a great scale, which each period or event in history contributes to fill out. It appoints those unvarying conditions of *permanence* and *average*, from which human conduct in the mass can never depart very far, and to which the return swing of the pendulum will presently bring it back. It sets the height of the middle

* The "possibility of arbitrary intervention" is the only essential idea which he allows modern theism to have retained. Vol. VI. p. 713.

† See "Christian Examiner" for May, 1846, Vol. V. of this Series, p. 346.

tide, which the perpetual ebb and flow may pass and re-pass for ever, without obliterating the metes and bounds, or contradicting that Eternal Word which says, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." It defines the point towards which human evolution is for ever tending, and foreordains the steps that conduct to it. All this, as we understand it, and are far from wishing to deny, illustrates the province and operation of Law, and as such is always open to be studied scientifically. But it also speaks to us of a Will behind that law. It is as essential to the providential as to the scientific interpretation of the history of mankind: and so science, in every conceivable stage of its development, can never be any thing else to us than an expounding of the principles of that "Art, whereby God made and governs the world."

This view, that Law is the working of an immutable Will, our author is pleased* to call "an ingenious artifice" of the schoolmen. To us it is the necessary modern transformation and interpretation of the equally necessary fundamental religious thought. By every test we have a right to apply, that thought is shown to be native and inalienable, — necessarily inwrought in the constitution of the human mind. It has survived every change of knowledge or belief; it survived that greatest of all intellectual revolutions, the accepted proof of the motion of the earth; it has only taken new shape and fresh impulse when compelled to shift its ground, without losing any thing of its vigor or its identity. As soon as any form of belief, any statement of science, becomes fixed and familiar, it is forthwith made the subject-matter of religious speculation, and the basis of a new religious conception. We have not been particularly impressed, ourselves, with the argument of Chalmers's "Astronomical Discourses," or Babbage's "Bridgewater Treatise," or the translucid speculations of "The Stars and the Earth." But all these have a significance far more important than their special trains of thought; which is, as illustrations of the proposition just stated. The religious mind transmutes the "fixed facts," of whatever order, into food and stimulus for its devotion, readily and easily as the sunlight trans-

* Vol. V. p. 712.

mutely vague drifts of mist into vast fields flooded with glory. And we do not apprehend any possible form that may be given to human knowledge, which can alter this primary and unchanging fact in the constitution of the human mind. The "theological state" is not deserted and left behind, since no element of our culture ceases in its effect upon us; but is taken up and carried along with the progress of the mind, and made to harmonize with the successive stages of its development. M. Comte might have seen this fact, if he had attended more carefully and less scornfully to the course of thought in Protestant countries. Not to have seen it, involves what we must regard as a most unfortunate feature, if not a radical vice and fallacy, of his work.

We are the more interested in this argument, that the work we have been considering contains what is doubtless the ultimate form of religious unbelief. Already, as will have been seen, the current is turned; and from a blind and prejudiced hostility towards every religious conviction alike, the present phasis of denial accepts the historical significance of each, and its essential office in aid of human development. It is a calm, dispassionate, broad judgment, even if at times prejudiced and austere, which is brought to bear upon them. The utmost that can be said is, that science has completely driven off the officious interference of theology. It has vindicated its own mental independence, and its own sufficient basis. Henceforth, we shall hear of no such platitudes as the especially religious character of this or that science, or the ignorant marvel and reproach of religious men at the undevoutness of scientific men. The two departments of thought are likely to stand hereafter by their independent principles and their separate evidence. We think it is best they should. The processes of science were long enough cumbered with theological prejudice; and we have not to wonder if theology is now and then sued for arrears. It is useless to deny or overlook the evident fact, that, in the present condition of things, theology would be the worse sufferer in an open conflict. She need not supplicate for mercy; but she should calmly and patiently abide by her own ground. It may be, that for the guiding of the general thought, for hints of ethical doctrine, for maxims and grounds of intellectual certainty, for the

conditions of substantial well-being and social order, we must go first to the principles and methods of natural science, understood in its magnificent breadth and compass, as here defined. But theology can afford to yield gracefully, where she once ruled triumphantly. Knowledge and Faith will still as ever divide the broad firmament of human thought. Knowledge comprehends that which is within the visible horizon: Faith apprehends that which is beyond. The circle of the first may widen, and the boundaries of the other will be more remote. But nothing can effectually be lost or diminished from the Infinite. And Religion, as the inspiration of Thought, the soul of Goodness, and the light of Life, will hold its own.

J. H. A.

ART. III.—UNITARIANISM IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES.*

THE Rev. Robert Wallace, author of the work before us, after completing the regular course of study at Manchester College, York, commenced life in 1815 as a Unitarian clergyman in Chesterfield, whither he was invited by the congregation of Elder-Yard Chapel, previously under the pastoral care of the Rev. George Kenrick. From this place, where his services were highly valued, he was called in 1840 to fill the chair of Theology in the collegiate institution at Manchester. Here he labored for six years, enjoying the respect and love of all who knew him, and performing his duties to the entire satisfaction of the committee and the public, until the state of his health obliged him to relinquish his post for some less arduous work in a more agreeable atmosphere. Immediately on resigning his

* *Antitrinitarian Biography: or Sketches of the Lives and Writings of distinguished Antitrinitarians; exhibiting a View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship in the principal Nations of Europe, from the Reformation to the Close of the Seventeenth Century. To which is prefixed a History of Unitarianism in England during the same Period.* By ROBERT WALLACE, F. G. S., and member of the Historico-Theological Society of Leipzig. London: E. T. Whitfield. 1850. 3 vols. 8vo. pp. lxxx., 461, 590, 638.

professorship, he went to Bath, at the cordial invitation of the society worshipping in Trim Street Chapel; and here, after preaching nearly four years, his life was brought to a close, on the 13th of May, 1850, two months only after the publication of the "Antitrinitarian Biography." His career was uneventful. It was a life of plain, homely, diligent usefulness. His cast of mind was grave and inquiring; not imaginative, but fond of dry research, patient and persevering. In social disposition, he was mild, cheerful, and affectionate; not passionate or demonstrative, but genial and true. Mr. Wallace was no genius. He was nothing more than a hard, conscientious student in the learning of the past, candid, liberal, industrious, an old-fashioned searcher of the Scriptures, and content to get his truth from them. In his departments of study he became distinguished; for besides the honorable office he held at Manchester, he was a member of the Historico-Theological Society of Leipsic. For a modern clergyman Mr. Wallace was rather a voluminous author; writing not only upon theological, but also upon philological and scientific subjects. But he will be known mainly as a stout champion of Unitarianism: and here his fame will rest, as he desired it should, upon the book under review. At intervals, for twenty-four years, he toiled upon this work with most laudable devotedness. Still, it is but a fragment of what he originally designed to produce, and, we may add, of what he should have produced with his materials. Mr. Wallace at first proposed, as his preface informs us, "to point out the origin, and trace the gradual development of the doctrine of the Trinity; secondly, to produce testimonies of ante-Nicene writers to the supremacy of the Father; and thirdly, to give a series of biographical notices of those, who, since the general reception of the doctrine of the Trinity among Christians, have rejected or impugned that doctrine." But this original plan of the work was abandoned as too large. Then he thought he would deal only with the third division of his scheme, and would merely give an account of Antitrinitarians from the Christian Fathers of the fourth century to the present time. This outline again proving too comprehensive, he determined to commence with the Reformation. But even now, the task was heavier than he chose to undertake, and he finally concluded to cut off

the end of his story as well as the beginning, and to limit himself to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This and no more he has given us, — the memoirs, scanty enough too, of unobscure Unitarians, whether authors or not, who lived in a section of two hundred years. The materials of the book are derived mainly from the older works of Sandius, Bock, and Zeltner, and from the more modern ones of Trechsel and Illgen.* The method is essentially that of Sandius, chronological. Mr. Wallace has certainly spared no pains to make his book perfect according to his idea. It is sufficiently learned; evidence is accumulated upon every doubtful biographical or bibliographical point; there is a full catalogue of each author's writings, sometimes occupying more space than the account of his life and opinions. The disputed details of personal history are carefully dwelt upon. If one wishes to know about the Unitarianism of John Locke or Sir Isaac Newton, the authenticity of Milton's "Treatise on Christian Doctrine," or Calvin's treatment of Servetus, Mr. Wallace can tell him of such things. The volumes are very elaborately written; indeed, the language is so consciously precise as to be in some places obscure, and even incorrect. Scrupulous accuracy in reporting historical facts is the chief merit of the book. It is far from being interesting. It is dull and hard; not very nutritious. It is neither dramatic nor pictorial, as it might easily have been. It is not historical or philosophical, as it certainly ought to have been. It exhibits no unity or harmony of plan whatever. We have not here a connected history of the external fortunes of Unitarianism, unless the convenient Chronological Table prefixed to the first volume may be considered such. We are not told of its rise, its progress, and its extension, of its fate in different countries, of its advantages and disadvantages in respect to legal and social position, of the influences that favored or obstructed it, of its patrons, professors, or schools; in short, we have nothing like a comprehensive, historical view of the civil, social, and theological position of Unitarianism. Neither does Mr. Wallace give the internal history of Unitarianism. He should have told us

* Numerous other writings that treat of his subject in its general and particular aspects have been likewise faithfully consulted; and appended to each biography is a copious list of authorities, very valuable.

wherein it essentially differs from Romanism and from Protestantism; he should have traced along the development of its primal germs, and should have indicated the share which the most distinguished of his three hundred and sixty teachers had in unfolding and establishing the doctrine. Their place should have been assigned according to their position in the system they represented. Nothing of the kind has Mr. Wallace done. He gives us only a collection of articles placed in loose chronological juxtaposition, having no coherence of relation, circumstance, or thought. English, Polish, Swiss, Italians, Arians, Humanitarians, Baptists, and Anabaptists, are ranged independently side by side, as in a Biographical Dictionary. His account of individual opinions is in some instances far from satisfactory. Even the views of such men as Michael Servetus and Faustus Socinus are stated in a doubtful and fragmentary way, by no means philosophical. For these reasons the book will not be entertaining, or even instructive, to the general reader; though as a compendium of knowledge for reference, as a dictionary of dates and authorities, as a digest of information, literary and biographical, collected from reliable and not very accessible sources, it will be valuable to the antiquarian and the student of religious literature. The most interesting part of these volumes is the last half of the "Historical Introduction," containing a sketch of Unitarianism in England. This portion is really entertaining. Mr. Wallace describes the controversy between Dr. Sherlock and Dr. South, and the controversy that grew out of Locke's "Reasonableness of Christianity," simply by giving the titles of the pamphlets that appeared on either side, with the circumstances that called them forth, and occasional extracts exhibiting the line of argument and the tone of the discussion. We are thus made to sympathize with the spirit of the time. Local and personal allusions are explained. Here and there is a piece of curious information on a point of authorship. The old style of language, and the minute facts which are thrown in, give a better coloring to the sketch than any artistic grouping could have imparted.

One or two thoughts were suggested to us in reading of these older controversies in the seventeenth century. Both in substance and mode of reasoning they were strikingly

similar to that of our own time. The learning on either side was meagre; the acuteness very considerable; the sarcasm perhaps was more distinguished than either. As to the materials of the argument, they are as carefully gathered and as effectively used in those little, old-fashioned quarto volumes as in any of our modern lectures and tracts. Indeed, if it be profitable to publish any more in that vein, we should recommend the reprinting of several pamphlets once distinguished, now forgotten, and especially of one tract, published in 1695, entitled "A Discourse concerning the Nominal and Real Trinitarians." As to the manner of controversy, the advantage is decidedly with us. It is not customary for a disputant now to call his antagonist a "flourishing scribbler," an "undertaker," "egregious whiffler," "notorious dissembler," or, as Dr. Zwicker termed Dr. Bull, "bipedum ineptissimus." Tilotson, in one of his sermons "Concerning the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour," complimented the Socinians upon their fairness and courtesy in debate, calling them "the strongest managers of a weak cause, and which is ill-founded at the bottom, that perhaps ever meddled with controversy." The hottest dispute was between the Trinitarians themselves. The doctrine of Dr. Sherlock, that "there are three distinct, intelligent, infinite beings, minds, spirits, and persons, distinguished just as three finite created minds or spirits are, as really distinct as three men, or as Peter, James, and John," was censured by a decree passed in Convocation at Oxford, in 1695, as "false, impious, and heretical; at variance with and contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and especially to the commonly received doctrine of the English Church." Some were in favor of yet more violent measures towards the Tritheists. There was a strong smell of the fagot in "A Short History of Valentine Gentilis, the Tritheist, tried, condemned, and put to Death by the Protestant Reformed City and Church of Berne in Switzerland, for asserting the Three Divine Persons of the Trinity to be (Three Distinct, Eternal Spirits, &c.) Wrote in Latin, by Benedict Aretius, a Divine of that Church; and now translated into English for the Use of Dr. Sherlock; humbly tendered to the Consideration of the Archbishops and Bishops of this Church and Kingdom. London. 1696.'" (12mo.) Indeed, the Athanasians and the Sabellians,

the Arians and the Trinitarians, in the bosom of the Church, were so warmly engaged together, that the Unitarians were counselled to remain quiet, and let their adversaries devour each other. At this time, we are told that none of the Unitarians "had any set meetings for the propagation of their doctrines, as men of other persuasions had," but that they mingled with the established societies,—many of them being professed members of the Church of England, a few connecting themselves with the other religious bodies. They wrote for the most part anonymously, keeping their names so closely concealed that an orthodox writer confessed himself "a perfect stranger to them," knowing "nothing of the gentlemen but their books."

But we must come to the main design of the work before us; which is, to describe the position of Unitarianism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Upon this point we would offer a few remarks; not following Mr. Wallace, who leads us nowhere, who only takes three hundred and sixty leaps from the history of one individual to the history of another; but rather doing what Mr. Wallace does not, and attempting a brief sketch of Antitrinitarianism during those two hundred years.

Dissent from the Romish Church took manifold shapes, and appeared simultaneously in a great many places. At the commencement of the Reformation, the mass of the theological opinion was huge, chaotic, shapeless; the germs of future opposing doctrines were there, but hardly distinguishable. All was fluctuating and ambiguous. The strangest combinations presented themselves. The ecclesiastical element was mingled with the political and social; theoretical and practical, rational and supernatural, mystical and intellectual, orthodoxy and heterodoxy, reformation and revolution, were confusedly grouped together, conscious as yet of no radical disagreement. The speculative reason, freed from its bondage, first by the gradual advance of philosophical thought, and finally by the open protest against church authority in matters of faith, naturally disported itself somewhat recklessly, and ran into extremes. Luther's Reformation had a practical aim; he protested against actually existing moral abuses; but the practical soon involved the speculative, and the bold stand of the true-hearted monk against wrong en-

couraged the numerous thinkers and doubters to speak their word against error. We are not surprised, therefore, to find Antitrinitarian sentiments more or less clearly defined, and involving to a greater or less degree the denial of kindred doctrines, prevailing in a wide circumference around the main centre of agitation. But a few localities were chiefly distinguished as seats of Unitarianism. Switzerland was one of these. Lewis Hetzer, the learned Biblical scholar, the liberal inquirer, the impetuous Reformer, John Denk, who was banished from Nuremberg, and James Kautz of Bockenheim, an enthusiastic young preacher, labored and suffered here. Hetzer was executed for blasphemy at Constance in 1529; Denk died at Basle of the plague a year earlier; and Kautz, his friend, preached against popular errors, heeding no opposition, until he was imprisoned at Strasburg. Switzerland, too, is the place where Michael Servetus met the awful fate of burning, at the instigation of Calvin. Servetus was the first man who made any thing like a systematic and many-sided attack upon the orthodox belief. His own views seem not to have been rigorously defined, for his deep religious feeling and his keen dialectical skill were often at variance, and between them both, his genuine talent for theological speculation was disturbed and misled. But his writings made a profound impression upon his age. Servetus was a noted man. Born in Spain, he early visited Basle and Strasburg and Lyons; he practised medicine in Paris, and afterward in the South of France; and he was on his way to Naples when the authorities arrested him at Geneva. In all these places he had friends. He was acquainted with leading Reformers in Germany and Switzerland, and was personally known to Calvin, with whom he corresponded, and whom he tried to engage in a public discussion. At the time of Servetus's death, Unitarianism had many adherents in Switzerland. Refugees from Italy, flying from the wrath of Rome, were seeking shelter in the tranquil neighbouring valleys where their brethren were assembled.

The principles of the Reformation early penetrated into Italy; they spread fast there, and struck deep root. Italy was the land of infidelity. There the abuses of the Church were the most outrageous and glaring. The re-

vival of classical learning, and the spirit of classical antiquity, never extinguished, were opening the eyes of men, and refining their taste so that the hollowness and immorality of the prevailing religion could neither be concealed nor palliated. But the Italian temper was not reformatory, and the power of the Church was despotic; accordingly, doubt in Italy, instead of calling forth protest, only led to indifference and contempt for all religion. The upper classes were atheistical, but loved their ease and privileges. The lower classes were atheistical, but destitute of culture. The Reformers were the educated of the middle class. These persons were at first distributed in many places; but gradually came together, drawn by their affinities, and formed the school at Vicenza. Of this school very little is known, nor is that little satisfactory. From the scanty notices of it, we can infer, however, that the tendency of speculation was very radical. The brethren, to the number of forty, — not all present at one time, and probably not all connected with the school at one time, — debated the high points of the Roman Catholic system, and especially the dogmas of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, satisfaction, and the rest, though probably after the manner of negation, and not from any positive philosophical basis of faith. There might have been other conclaves besides this one at Vicenza, but this one has become celebrated from its influence and the great names of its members. The duration of its existence also contributed to its fame. The brotherhood, by great secrecy, were able to escape the grasp of persecution until the middle of the sixteenth century. But at last they were discovered and compelled to flee; some were put to death in Venice, a few went into Asia, the remainder took refuge in Switzerland. And from this time Unitarianism began to separate itself from the other Protestant systems, and to assume an independent position. Many distinguished names are connected with this period of its history; among others those of Ochinus, Vergerius, Negri, Renatus, Blandrata, Gentilis, and Paul Alciati. Now likewise appears Lælius Socinus, who merits a word of special notice. Socinus did much to advance the Unitarian cause; not as an avowed champion, for he was timid, would not commit himself to any distinct propositions, evaded close questioning, urged his doubts hypothetically, and had no

mind to be a martyr; not as a systematic thinker, for although he possessed considerable subtilty of mind, and pushed his skepticism far, even to the point of doubting the Trinity, Satisfaction, Justification, the Sacraments, the Resurrection of the Body, and other matters whereof to doubt was perilous, he nevertheless at intervals hesitated, retracted, and held his views loosely. But as a man of education and birth, diligent, enthusiastic, and able, of large acquaintance and ubiquitous presence, Lælius made his influence felt. He studied the Bible earnestly when a mere boy, and even then doubted. In 1546, although but twenty-one years of age, we find him at Venice and Vicenza. Driven from his home (he was a Tuscan by birth), he passed some months in the Grisons with Camillus Siculus; in Geneva he cultivated the friendship of Calvin and Beza; he labored in France; at Basle he was acquainted with Munster and Castaljo; at Zurich he lived with Pellican; at Wittenberg, he was intimate with Melancthon; he travelled in Poland and Moravia, interesting himself everywhere in religious inquiries, and finally died peacefully at Zurich in 1562. His ideas were more mighty in his successors, especially in his nephew Faustus, than they were in him.

Before the death of Lælius Socinus, Unitarianism was dying out in Switzerland. The extreme violence of the Calvinistic Reformers, the want of compactness among the Unitarians themselves, for as yet they had no common bond but the very loose one of dissent, and the fact that they were identified with the unpopular creed of the Anabaptists, conspired to break up their security, and when Valentine Gentilis was put to death at Berne in 1566, the storm of indignation was not so violent as it had been when Servetus was burned.

We hear no more of Socinianism in Switzerland. We must next follow it to Poland, whither the wanderers chiefly betook themselves. At this time circumstances favored the establishment of Protestantism in Poland. The princes of that country were at least tolerant. Sigismund the First, in 1534, was persuaded to issue an edict prohibiting the Polish youth from visiting foreign universities which were infected with heresy; but the edict was a dead letter, and in 1543 was formally abrogated by the Imperial Diet at Krakow. Sigismund the Second, who

reigned from 1548 to 1572, vacillated in his religious principles. Convinced of the radical corruption of the Romish Church, but at the same time placing little confidence in Protestantism, he exhibited through the whole of his life an uncertain mind. But on the whole, his policy favored the Unitarians. He restrained the Romanists, telling them, if their cause was good, to sustain it by argument, not by stripes. He allowed Protestants their religious freedom. The Senate, most of whom were adherents of the new doctrines, more than coöperated with the king. But the Reformation in Poland owed its strongest support to the nobles. They were a wealthy, privileged, independent, and powerful class, exercising all but sovereign authority on their own estates, and possessing the right by law of adopting such form of household religion as seemed to each best, provided only the Bible was assumed as its basis. They were, moreover, educated, intellectually daring, and bitterly opposed to the priesthood of Rome. Their own visits to foreign countries, and their familiar contact with foreign scholars, who sought refuge among themselves, afforded them the best opportunities for becoming acquainted with the finest thought of their age; and these opportunities were improved. Indeed, Krasinski tells us that, even in Paris, the nobles who went as ambassadors to inform Henry of Anjou of his election to the throne, as successor of Sigismund, excited universal admiration by their learning and culture. These men sympathized with the most liberal ideas of the Reformers, both on their speculative and their practical side, and especially were they inclined to the Unitarians as patrons of polite learning.

In Poland, too, after 1539, the press was free. About the middle of the sixteenth century, Prince Nicholas Radzivil established a printing-press at Brest in Lithuania, where a translation of the whole Bible in Polish was printed. Later, there was a large printing establishment at Rakow, which issued some of the writings of Faustus Socinus. When now to the immense benefit of a free press is added the impotence of the Roman clergy, and the tolerance, as yet, of the Protestant ministers, sufficient cause is assigned for the success of Unitarianism in Poland. Thither flocked the exiles from Switzerland and Italy, making their headquarters at Pinczow, whence

their name Pinczovians. For ten years they remained without disturbance within the pale of the Reformed Church, freely prosecuting their inquiries. Gonesius wrote boldly against the Trinity, and assailed the doctrine of Infant Baptism. Blandrata insisted that only the language of Scripture should be used in speaking of God and Christ. Francis Stancarus taught that Christ mediated only as a man. Gregory Pauli publicly preached against the preëxistence of Jesus. Peter Statorius said that the Holy Ghost was only the power of God's grace in the soul. This freedom by and by alarmed the orthodox Reformers, and it was not long before the Unitarians became a distinct church, known as the *ecclesia minor*. From this time the development of their doctrine was more rapid; but its advance was irregular and confused. They disputed among themselves. They were rent by internal controversies upon essential points of faith. They were under no authority, and they possessed no common principles of truth. They were an unorganized band of dissenters. At this juncture Faustus Socinus appears, and introduces a new era in the history of Unitarianism. The floating elements are combined into a system. The loose fragments that compose Unitarianism are worked up into a whole, which is for a time to be called Socinianism.

Faustus Socinus spent his life in organizing the Antitrinitarians, a work for which he was peculiarly qualified. He was of noble descent, being connected on his mother's side with the ancient and famous family of Piccolomini, while by marrying the daughter of Christopher Merstinus he became related to the chief nobility of Poland. To this very powerful influence of family, he added that of a subtle, laboring, versatile, and ready mind, a charming disposition, and an agreeable manner. He was enthusiastic and patient; not a man of deep religious feeling, — no mystic, no profound philosopher, — rather a dialectician and moralist; a dissector and compounder of creeds, not a revealer of spiritual truth; a man of keen intellect, rather than of lofty soul, not, properly speaking, a genius, but still a man thoroughly convinced of the importance of his work, and pursuing it with a single purpose. His external circumstances likewise aided him in the part he was to fulfil, by offering the necessary field for

his talents. His parents died young, and he accordingly received but an indifferent education. He learned nothing of philosophy or of scholastic theology, very little of polite literature; he had only the rudiments of Logic. "God," he tells us, "was his only teacher, and the Holy Word." His active, bright mind was early directed towards religious and theological questions, under the influence of his uncle Lælius. At the age of twenty he was exiled from Italy. He went to Lyons and was studying there when his uncle's death called him to Zurich to take possession of his papers. Twelve years now, passed at Florence with the Grand Duke, gave to his mind that easy refinement which proved so serviceable in his later intercourse with men, and ripened his intellect to maturity. While living at the court, the impulse to theological inquiry, the craving of an insatiable doubt, seized him with irresistible force. He could not remain in Italy with his opinions; and nothing was left but to sacrifice the honors and pleasures of a courtier, wealth, prospects, and friends, to the demand of conviction. He took up his residence in Basle, where he spent four years elaborating his system, and discussing it. At this period, he published two of his most remarkable works. While thus employed, he was called aside by Blandrata, to engage in controversy with that party among the Unitarians who refused worship to Christ; and henceforward we see him fearless and untiring, laboring to heal the divisions that rent asunder his brethren.

Socinus was at issue with the Unitarians on many points. They would not admit him to their fellowship because he refused to be baptized anew. Besides his rejection of Anabaptism, some objected to his theory of the Atonement, his view of the Lord's Supper, and his explanation of the seventh chapter of Romans. Others repudiated his doctrine of the Holy Spirit, or looked blank at his denial of eternal damnation. The Arians found fault with his belief concerning Preëxistence; and the Humanitarians opposed him of course for teaching the worship of Christ. Nevertheless, Faustus Socinus was not to be deterred from devoting all his strength to the cause of Unitarianism. He labored, by speech and writing; he instructed, exhorted, disputed, attended synods, issued epistles, never losing sight of his leading object,

and even when he failed to convince, demanding still, and securing, a charitable tolerance of opinion. And to him was granted the satisfaction near the close of his life of seeing the fruit of his toil. He procured uniformity on the main points of his system. His liberal view of Baptism prevailed at a synod in Rakow, convened in 1603, the year before his death. The Budnæans, or disciples of Simon Budnæus, who contended that Jesus Christ was born in the ordinary mode of generation, and was therefore no object of divine homage, had lost their influence in Poland. In Lithuania, a synod assembled at Nowogrodek, in 1600, solemnly asserted the necessity of offering worship to Christ. At the same time, the Arian party were decreasing in numbers and weight.

To accomplish all this Socinus labored within the circle of Unitarianism. But to that circle his labors were by no means limited. He engaged both Protestants and Romanists in controversy, issuing works of an apologetic and polemical kind with extraordinary rapidity and power. And while his mind seemed to be thus continually abroad, he was also a close student of the Bible. In 1602, though suffering from a disease of the eyes, he dictated a translation of the Sermon on the Mount. At about the same period, he composed his Commentary upon the First Epistle of John. The "*Prælectiones Theologicæ*," an unfinished work, published after his death, containing an exposition of the prominent doctrines of the Socinian creed, belongs likewise to this time. With all this, he carried on an extensive correspondence, being in constant communication with the leaders and churches of Antitrinitarian faith.

In 1583 Socinus left Krakow, which had been his home for four years, apprehending personal danger. From this time, he was to see many dark days. He was married, but soon after the birth of his daughter lost his wife. He was seized with a dangerous illness. His friend, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, dying, he was deprived of the income from his Italian estates, — long threatened, but secured to him hitherto by Isabella Medici and her brother. These successive disappointments he bore with the utmost patience; not resigning himself to grief, but comforting his heart with the work he had set before him. After a retirement of two years he returned to Krakow,

but not to enjoy tranquillity there. Since the death of Sigismund the Second, in 1572, the prospects of Protestantism in Poland had been sadly overcast. The Roman party recovered itself, and commenced the old battle anew. It is true that, at the Imperial Diet of Warsaw, Protestantism obtained a full recognition before the law. The intrigues of Henry of Valois came to nothing. Stephen Bathory confirmed the religious liberty of the Reformed Churches. Fortune, nevertheless, was adverse to them. The Jesuits were invited to the realm, and as soon as they appeared, distrust began to alienate the Confessions from each other. The Society of Jesus labored incessantly, and having complete sway over the young king, Sigismund the Third, found little difficulty in executing their plans. The Protestants were gradually removed from posts of influence; offices of emolument and dignity were offered to all who would return to the Church; the populace even were instigated to acts of violence against the dissenters. In many places, Protestant churches and schools were demolished, and professors exposed to violent ill-treatment. Seldom were the rioters punished; for their supporters and abettors were powerful. The rights and privileges of Protestants were entirely disregarded; and, worse still, the popular spirit was embittered and filled with the bigot's wrath. From the fury of this persecution Socinus did not escape. Upon Ascension Day, 1598, as he lay sick upon his bed, a crowd of Krakovian students rushed into his dwelling, seized his papers, and dragged him half naked through the streets, amid the yells of an infuriated mob. His books they burned in the public square, and, as their smoke ascended, menaced him with the same fire in case he did not retract. But Socinus undismayed cried out, "I retract not; what I have been, I am, and will be to my last breath; do what God permits you." Then went up a shout of rage. A hasty counsel was taken. It was concluded to throw the infidel into the Vistula. Already was the procession moving, when the cries and hurrying of feet called to the window a professor in the University. He stopped the throng, rebuked them, saved the victim from their hands, sheltered him, and gave him refreshment. That same night Socinus left Krakow by stealth, never to reside there again. The remaining six years of his life he

passed mostly at Luclavice, a little village in the vicinity. Here he labored as severely as ever, and here he died in peace, at the age of sixty-five. The object of his life was fulfilled. He had impressed upon an age of intolerance the principles of charity and brotherly love. He had vindicated the right of private thought. This was his service to Protestantism. He established unity of faith among the Socinians. This was his service to Unitarianism. Immediately after his death appeared the Rakovian Catechism. This expressed the life and thought of Faustus Socinus. It is the result of his energetic doing. He commenced the Catechism with the aid of his friend Statorius, in the latter years of his life, and left it unfinished. Statorius carried on the work while he lived, and at his death Valentin Schmaltz, Moskorzowski, and Völkel completed it. In 1605, the Catechism, which was grounded on the writings of Socinus, was published at Rakow, in Polish, with a smaller catechism for children. In 1608 a German translation appeared, dedicated to the University of Wittemberg. And in 1609 Moskorzowski dedicated a Latin version to James the First of England. A second edition, enlarged and improved, was issued at Amsterdam by Wissowaty and Stegmann in 1665. The third and fourth editions were printed at Amsterdam also, in 1680 and 1684.

In the preface to the second edition, the publishers took pains to state that the Catechism was not designed as a rule of faith. After urging against other Confessions, that they bind men's consciences, impose a yoke upon Christian people, make them swear by another's word and thought, and pronounce malediction upon all who vary from the rule by a hair's breadth, they go on to declare, — "Far from us be such a sense, or rather such a nonsense. We write a Catechism, but prescribe nothing; we express our views, but we oppress no other man's." Something better than this was written in the preface to the amended edition. A really noble passage it is. "We see no cause to blush that our Church has advanced. We disregard the loud arrogance which cries, 'I stand here: here my foot is planted, not to be removed.' The Stoic may hold every point fast, and abide perversely by the doctrine he has propounded; but it becomes a Christian philosopher, who is the disciple of that wisdom

which cometh from above, to be open to conviction, and ready to make concessions, if a better truth offers."

Socinus left the mark of a powerful individuality upon the Protestantism of his age; but he did not work single-handed. Many brave fellow-laborers had he, learned, eloquent, and sympathetic. But of these we cannot speak. Unitarianism culminated for the time in Socinus. We have now only to say a few words of its local decline.

Socinianism never possessed the popular mind in Poland. It found most of its disciples among the nobility and higher classes, who were prepared for it by their intellectual culture. Its very adoption by these was of itself enough to keep it from the common people, for between the upper and lower orders a great gulf was fixed. The former were refined, wealthy, learned, aristocratic, despotic. The latter were sensual, poor, ignorant, almost enslaved. While the Unitarians were Anabaptists, they found sympathy with the masses. But when Socinus had purged away Anabaptism, the popular element in his system was destroyed. Socinianism belonged to the nobles. This fact explains at once its rapid growth in extent and influence, and its equally rapid decline. The nobility could make Unitarianism respectable; but in the time of danger they were of all most exposed to the influences which were brought to bear upon the extreme Protestants, and to the temptations liberally offered to the Roman Catholic converts.

The Jesuits ruled in Poland, — ruled the populace and the king. In 1627 they succeeded in breaking up the Church in Lublin, one of the principal Unitarian communities. But this was only preliminary to an attack upon Rakow. Rakow was the peculiar seat of Socinianism, and the most eminent literary centre in Poland. It was founded by John Siennynski, a Protestant, in 1569, and distinguished exiles were at once attracted thither by the promise of liberty. Convocations met there; and in 1600 Jacob Siennynski established the school whose fame reached far beyond the borders of Poland. At this "Gymnasium" were taught the higher branches of philosophy and theology; from its printing-press were issued the most noted books of the time. It was under the patronage of the first Socinian nobles, and was called the Athens of Sarmatia. Here preached Ostorodt, Statorius,

Schmalz, the Lubienieckis, Schlichting, and others. Here taught Borrhäus, Crell, Ruarus, Adam Franck, Joachim and Lorenzo Stegmann. Under such auspices the school at Rakow acquired an extraordinary fame. In its palmy days it numbered a thousand students, of whom three hundred were of the nobility. Here Evangelicals and Papists studied by the side of Unitarians and Anabaptists. There was no distinction of creed, none of rank. The discipline was plain, severe, and democratic. Thus freedom, learning, and love made Rakow great.

Socinianism being too strong in Rakow for direct attack, the Jesuits had recourse to cunning. Their power was great over the people, and they waited only an occasion for using it. The occasion came. Some pupils of the school wantonly threw stones at a crucifix, placed outside the town. They were expelled; but the circumstance afforded sufficient ground of accusation against the school itself. The opportunity was seized; and in the face of opposition, a decree was passed on the 1st of May, 1638, devoting the school at Rakow to destruction, and placing all its preachers and professors under the ban of infamy. Remonstrance against this crying injustice was vain. The judgment was executed. The aged Siennynski died, broken of heart, and soon after the possession of Rakow fell into Roman Catholic hands; the church was dedicated to the "*Trine God*"; the school was abandoned, and the seat of intelligence and culture became a miserable village. The outcasts from Rakow fled to Kissielin, but Kissielin was likewise doomed. At the Colloquy of Thorn, from which the Socinians alone were peremptorily excluded, their last hope was confounded. Then came the wars, Kossack, Russian, and Swedish successively, bringing devastation upon the southern provinces of Poland, and special destruction upon the Unitarian communities which flourished there. The Swedish war proved most fatal to Socinianism in Poland. Many of the Unitarians joined the Swedish cause, expecting at least some amelioration of their sufferings. In this conduct they only followed the example of other Protestants, but being Socinians, their crime was greater, and now, besides their heresy, they incurred the additional odium of treason to their country. On the expulsion of the Swedes, in 1657, the fate of Socinianism was decided.

The Romanists procured a decree from John Kasimir, forbidding the confession of Arianism on pain of death, and ordering the officials to be strict in its execution under penalty of losing their places. This decree touched none but Socinians. Calvinist and Lutheran, Jew and Mahometan, were tolerated in Poland; being of an inferior quality, they were probably not so well worth persecuting. Doubtless the Church had an eye to the lands and offices, as well as to the souls, of the noble heretics. It was confident of getting one or the other, converts or crowns. The edict, atrocious at the best, but more atrocious as the violation of good faith and of a regal oath, went forth. "To show our clemency," it reads, "we will that every man who cleaves to his error be allowed a three years' respite, to sell his property, that his goods and person may be inviolate." During this interval, however, the exercise of religion and all participation in political affairs were strictly forbidden. But even this "clemency" was vouchsafed in irony; for Kasimir had sworn, in his coronation oath, that none should be persecuted for religion. That the character of this "clemency" might display itself to better advantage, after suitable delay another edict was passed, limiting the respite to two years. This was a ruse for gaining converts to Romanism through sudden fright. The Socinians could offer no resistance to this dreadful decree. The other Protestant sects, who should have seen their own safety endangered by such proceedings, chose to indulge their sectarian malice, instead of making common cause against Rome. The Socinians were wholly deserted. In vain they protested, appealing to old enactments and solemnly ratified privileges. Their efforts were useless. They who refused to become Roman Catholics must be exiled. Under the terrible pressure, a small proportion abandoned their faith. The remainder, except a few who chose to remain, wandered abroad over Europe in companies, poor and homeless. One band of five hundred were assaulted on the borders of Hungary, upon the very line of safety, by the Imperial troops, and robbed of what little they had, with insult and violence. Destitute and forlorn they came to Transylvania. The fugitives went to Germany, Silesia, and Prussia. They joined the little congregations of their brethren in the Netherlands; but persecution

followed them wherever they went; hunted by authority from the chief cities, they had no centre of influence and strength; with no root in the popular faith, and no permanent cohesion among themselves, they withered away. In Transylvania and the Netherlands Unitarianism dragged on a precarious life; but from the year 1660 we hear nothing of it until its new birth in England.

Several times in the course of this brief sketch of the history of Unitarianism, we have hinted at differences of opinion which existed among its professors. A word more now upon this point. Unitarians as a sect were knit together by an exceedingly fine thread. Their chief ground of sympathy was the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity, — a very general denial. They were also united by a common liberality of mind; some of them by similarity of social position and fortune. They were united as the outcasts from other communions. They clustered together as fugitives. But there was no Unitarianism. Socinianism, the culminating point of all the thinking in the Antitrinitarian direction, was the system of an individual mind, or of a cluster of minds under an individual influence. It did not grow spontaneously from the free intermingling and development of many thoughts, but it was authoritatively and persuasively enforced by discussion and personal address, — enforced even against some darling tenets and strong propensities of the Unitarians. Unitarianism would have worked itself out into a much more simple and rational shape, but for Socinus.

The system contained in the Rakovian Catechism was substantially the same with modern Unitarianism. In the details of doctrine there are discrepancies; but essentially we find the same principles and the same conclusions. The questions of Human Nature, the Bible, Reason and Revelation, Reason and the Bible, Inspiration and Miracles, the object and method of Christianity, and the relation of Jesus to mankind, are stated very much as we hear them stated among us now. The fundamental propositions or axioms which are brought to bear against the Trinity, axioms suggested by the case they were urged to meet, are the same that have been used so often since. The distinction between doctrines contrary to reason, and doctrines above reason, was insisted upon and applied at discretion. Indeed, in this application it

sometimes happened that the discretion was more conspicuous than the faithfulness to principle; or rather, perhaps, the principles of reason themselves were not very clearly defined. In the comparative estimate of the Old and New Testaments, and in the distinction between the essential and the unessential in Christianity, we are reminded also of our modern system. But this was Socinianism. Previous to the time of Faustus Socinus, and until a few years before his death, sharp discussions had taken place among the Unitarians upon vital points. At first there was nothing but confusion in their belief. They agreed only in a single article of disbelief. By and by, in 1574, appeared a Confession of Faith of Polish Unitarians in the form of a Catechism, prepared, as is most likely, by George Schomann. In this Catechism general dogmas were shadowed forth in vague language. The unity of God was asserted. The doctrine concerning Christ was expressed in the words of Scripture entirely, to the effect that he was the Mediator, promised to the fathers by the prophets, born of David's line, by God's will made to be Saviour, through whom man is to be reconciled to God and made partaker of immortal life. The Holy Spirit is the Power of God transmitted to mankind through the only begotten Son. In the idea of Justification was included the necessity of personal goodness, as well as the fact of absolution from sin and its penalties. Baptism, to be administered only to adults, was defined as the inward and outward purification of a man who repents; an acknowledgment that he is washed in the blood of Christ, and by the Holy Spirit purged from all sin. The Catechism adopted Zwingle's view of the Lord's Supper, which in the main accorded with that of the later Socinians, and regarded the institution simply as a commemorative rite. Within such general terms as these, there was certainly room enough for various opinions. Under so broad a roof enemies might dwell without collision. But the household was far from peaceful. While the Unitarians were unanimous in rejecting the Trinity, they were by no means agreed upon their doctrine of Christ. Some were Arians, holding that Jesus was preëxistent, had a superhuman side to his nature, and, associated with the Father, created the world. This view was strenuously maintained by Farnovius,

among others, whence the Unitarians got the name of Farnovians. Gregory Pauli, George Schomann, and their party, denied the preëxistence of Christ; said that his being commenced with his birth from the Virgin; that he was essentially a man, but since his ascension into glory was to be worshipped. Others, men of influence, Francis Davidis and Simon Budnæus at their head, went farther still, contending that Christ was not to be worshipped. Budnæus, as we have already remarked, even denied the supernatural birth of Jesus; said that he was the son of Joseph and Mary; and he was not alone in his opinion. Davidis used strong language; declared that Christ was the son of Joseph; that his words were not the words of God, and were to be tried by the Mosaic law; that the New Covenant existed only till the destruction of Jerusalem, and after that event would have no place till Jesus should come again; that Christ was no more to be worshipped than Mary and other dead saints, since he no longer discharges the function of Mediator between God and us. Faustus Socinus labored hard to convert this "semi-Judaizer," and resided at his house nearly six months for that purpose. But his arguments failed to convince. And no wonder; for Socinus, holding the Scripture in a powerful solution of exegesis, would not accept the preëxistence of Christ, and confessed there was no Bible authority for paying him homage, but in the same breath laid it down as a right and a duty, and even refused the Christian name to such as would not worship Jesus. As an instance of critical perversity, it must be mentioned how Socinus, as if to make amends for his numerous sins against the sacred text, concluded to save himself by sinning once more, and so, in scrupulous deference to John iii. 13 and vi. 62, affirmed that Christ ascended into heaven shortly before the commencement of his public ministry. Think of a man walking easily through the tangled passages in the Epistle to the Colossians, to stumble at last on a plain highway like this! Such were some of the prevailing opinions concerning the Trinity and its kindred dogmas.

On the question of Baptism, likewise, there were differences. The earlier Unitarians were Anabaptists, or at least strong opponents of infant baptism. Some only disapproved of infant baptism; others thought it a dam-

nable heresy. Some regarded it as of vital moment that adults should be baptized; others, Socinus at the head of them, treated the whole matter very lightly, saying that it was of no consequence whether one was baptized or not. This party were very magnanimously tolerant of their opponents, as uninterested people are wont to be.

Niemojewski, who believed that the communicant partook spiritually of the body of Christ, was bitterly opposed to Socinus, who viewed the Lord's Supper as a commemorative rite merely, and ascribed to it no peculiar efficacy of any sort.

Many of the Unitarians were exceedingly radical in their notions of society and government. Thus the learned and pious Gregory Pauli advocated a community of goods, and thought that Christians should neither accept civil offices, nor bear arms; a doctrine which the Socinian laity were especially unwilling to accept. John Niemojewski resigned his post as judge of the district of Krakow, from conscientious scruples about taking or exacting oaths. Of Martin Czechovicus Mr. Wallace says, "His opinions respecting worldly authorities were moderate, and he only recommended the refusal of obedience to them when they commanded actions contrary to the word of God." Czechovicus likewise contended that a Christian should neither accept of worldly offices, nor make use of weapons, and in other respects appears to have been a thorough *non-resistant*. Peter Gonesius turned the whole thing into ridicule by wearing a wooden sword. Such practical misgivings indicate that the Christian conscience was alive. These men were not merely active in head, but in heart also. It is surprising, if we may credit Mr. Wallace and Christopher Sandius, how clear from moral delinquencies were the characters of these heretics. They were not faultless; one or two were slightly stained with personal vices; some of their chief teachers were not wholly free from intolerance; but their average of moral character was high, and among them were exhibited instances of extraordinary self-sacrifice. They seem for the most part to have been natural men, believing in goodness and humanity, loving the beauty of virtue, trusting to the efficacy with God and men of a pure, true life. They were learned men for the most part; in their number were the best scholars of the age. A few had genius. Many had talents, and the

finest education their time offered. They were sharp reasoners and bold; mighty in the Scriptures; acquainted also with philosophy, which they were too wise to fear, to distrust, or to abhor. Their thinking was free; the activity of their minds overbalanced the weight of authority, so that in any conflict between Scripture and Reason, though Reason professed submission, it was Scripture that submitted. They respected the Bible too much to believe that it could disagree with them. They were not prepared to set up their opinions against the Bible, nor yet were they prepared to set up the Bible against their opinions; so they compromised by making the text conform. Their canons of interpretation were framed very much to suit their occasions. But so were all canons of interpretation framed. Theirs had a general advantage of result, if not of principle, for their opinions were better worth conforming to; and if their view of the Scriptures was cloudy and disturbed, and their practical treatment of them most unjustifiable, still much was done by the Unitarians to destroy the slavish adoration of texts, and to promote a free, rational, plain way of dealing with the Sacred Word. Had their course been unimpeded, theology would doubtless have been advanced by this time far beyond its present limits.

But the question arises, why was their course so fatally impeded? How was it that such men, so learned and worthy, carried no more influence with them? The obvious reply to this question is, that they were a small and odious minority, exposed to the whole power of the prevailing or established religions. So long as they had fair play in Poland, they held their own, nay, they increased. But as soon as the Jesuits were admitted to the kingdom, persecution came, and they were scattered. Protestant and Romanist were against them in Europe; Protestant and Romanist were against them in England. The people, strongly sectarian, were bitterly prejudiced in their hostility. They had no peace in believing. They were deprived of opportunities for organizing and spreading themselves. The public sentiment forbade their forming separate communions. The expression of their opinions rendered them liable to such pains as could be visited upon them. All this was unfavorable to their growth as a body of Christians.

But this alone was hardly sufficient to account for the

powerlessness of the Socinian doctrine. Even with the mighty of the world arrayed against it, it would have flourished but for some defect in itself. There was that inherent in the system which prevented its taking root in the hearts of men. In the first place, its ethical character was not congenial to the minds of people educated in the popular faith. The other religions insisted upon a supernatural virtue. They wanted to bring God miraculously into man, to sink man in God. They desired to produce, not goodness, but holiness, sanctification, regeneration. The common people had been accustomed to having their religious sensibilities kindled and agitated by Popish ceremonies and Calvinistic terrors. They craved the excitement of an unnatural, overawing belief, which kept their nature pliable under the horrible omnipotence or the weeping compassion of God. Socinianism, on the contrary, dwelt more on the power of the human will; appealed to the moral faculties; separated man from God by too wide a gulf; addressed itself, not to the religious feeling, but to the conscience, and thus of necessity brought down our religion's noble aspirations, and absorbing faith, and profound self-annihilation, to the plain works of common duty. Few of the Socinians were deeply religious men. They communicated no original piety to mankind. They were not through and through penetrated with a sense of God's reality, and therefore their teaching failed to nourish the soul. This is no matter of marvel. There could be no original spiritual life, except as the Good Father gave it here and there to an individual, among men who were all engaged in working themselves free from a complex theological system. The other sects were no better off than the Socinians. They only ruled by right of possession, and by the power of established doctrines. But then it required a far mightier power, even a fresh inspiration of Divine Love, to dispossess them; and that new revelation came not through the Socinians.

Again, Socinianism demanded more intellectual culture than the people possessed. The Protestant needed to be a man of stronger mind and more practised thought than the Romanist. The Socinian needed to be a man of stronger mind and more practised thought than the Protestant, because he gave his reason more work to do.

The Protestant of the Protestants, he threw off more than the Church authority, and, with his increase of intellectual liberty, gained an increase of intellectual responsibility. The Romanist and the Lutheran leaned their reason against a creed. They had their fundamental tenets established. Their theory of God and man, and Christ and the Bible, was determinately fixed, beyond discussion. This state of things afforded amazing comfort to the slumbering mind. The Socinian had no creed ultimately defined; he had no doctrines of God and man, of Christ and the Bible, which were placed beyond the reach of criticism and doubt, or in any manner assumed as dogmatical. He was a seeker. He proved all things, but had not yet found what good thing he should hold fast. He was neither supernaturalist nor naturalist, neither bibliolater nor rationalist, neither Arian nor humanitarian. He believed that man was neither wholly good nor wholly evil, that he was neither master of his moral will nor yet predestinated by God. He had not quite made up his mind where the facts of religion were. His position was a very trying one. It demanded great boldness, ingenuity, and alacrity of thought. It was not such a position as one would voluntarily assume. Only the few, who were driven into it by the inevitable doubt which is rare in the mass of men, would choose to accept its dangers. Not many persons will swim a torrent when there is an old bridge, ever so old, and ever so rotten, a mile higher up the stream. Hence Unitarianism found its adherents among the educated, thoughtful, and refined, almost exclusively in Poland, and to a very considerable extent in England. The distinguished Socinian professors of England were not farther removed from the people by their Antitrinitarianism than by their genius. Milton's "Comus" was probably no more interesting to the millions than his "Treatise on Christian Doctrine"; and John Locke's "Reasonableness of Christianity" doubtless found as many intelligent disciples among the multitude as his "Essay on the Human Understanding." As to Sir Isaac Newton, we need say nothing about him.

It is easy, then, to explain the failure of Unitarianism. But it is hard to say how much we regret that failure. With the Socinian system, as expounded in the Rakovian Catechism, we have little sympathy. We perceive its in-

completeness and inconsistency; we are sensible of the want of a corner-stone in its building. But with Socinianism as a movement tending towards a more scientific treatment of religion and a more philosophical handling of theology, we have very great sympathy. Had the schools at Rakow and Altorf continued to flourish, we should have had by this time a better doctrine of human nature, a better doctrine consequently of the Divine nature, and then a nobler theory of Christianity, and the character of its founder, — a theory based upon facts, and not upon hypothesis.

Had Socinianism only given us a truer version of the Bible, or been present when our English translation was made, it would have done immense service. Notwithstanding the severe critical labors of the Polish brethren, their copious commentaries and ponderous editions of the Scriptures, the dullest eye can see that we have got, so to speak, a Trinitarian Bible. We by no means think that the whole Bible is susceptible of a Socinian or humanitarian interpretation, any more than that the whole Bible is susceptible of an Arian interpretation. But the good doctors who prepared King James's version discovered Trinitarianism everywhere, and even pressed into their service passages which, to say the least, were innocent of any such meaning. We will give one or two examples for illustration. Acts xx. 28, "The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." According to the present established reading, it should be "the Church of the Lord," that is, of Christ. The pointing of Romans ix. 5, "Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever," indicates the Trinitarian bias. Quite as arbitrary is the rendering of 1 Tim. iii. 16: "Great is the mystery of godliness"; as if the writer was speaking of the *Godhead*, or the *Divine nature*, instead of referring to the new manifestation of *piety* in Christ. Again, in the supplying of words by Italics, the most unwarrantable liberties have been taken. Thus, 1 John iii. 16, the words "of God" are not in the original, but were invented for the translators' purpose. "The Lord of glory," 1 Cor. ii. 8, does not give exactly the idea of the Greek. "Glorious Lord" is more correct, and much less exalted. There are a great many passages in which Christ is improperly made in our version the object of worship. Matt. viii. 2, "There

came a leper and *worshipped* him"; Matt. xiv. 33, "They that were in the ship came and *worshipped* him"; and elsewhere. The word translated "worshipped" means simply "bowed down before him," that is, in obeisance and profound respect. But we cannot enlarge upon this point. It would lead us too far. If any are curious enough to follow out the hint, we refer them to Wilson's "Illustrations of Unitarianism," where the matter is very sufficiently handled.

Trinitarianism has appropriated to itself almost every mode of religious expression. We have Trinitarian prayers and hymns. Many of the noblest sacred songs in the language are so disfigured by it, that the power and beauty of their devotional sentiment are nearly destroyed. Some of the most magnificent music of the Church is made useless, except to the Trinitarian believer, or to him who can forget his belief. Well, the advance of thought cannot be retarded for ever. If you dam up a moving stream, the waters will cause devastation by their overflow, or will burst through the barrier with a more impetuous current. Sooner or later, we must have a rational religion and a scientific theology; a religion grounded upon the moral and spiritual constitution of man, and a theology conformed to the principles and facts of human reason.

O. B. F.

ART. IV. — SOUTHEY'S LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF ROBERT SOUTHEY.*

THIS work does not rise to the rank of a complete and well-digested biography. It comprises, indeed, a large amount of information respecting Southey's private life and daily habits; but this information is of the nature of raw material, and requires long and patient labor to bring it into an available form. Much of it, too, is exceedingly

* *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey.* Edited by his Son, the REV. CHARLES CUTHBERT SOUTHEY, M. A., Curate of Plumbland, Cumberland. In six volumes. London: Printed for Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1849-50. Post 8vo. pp. xii. and 352, 360, 352, 390, 368, 408.

dry and profitless; and the whole work has a disagreeable appearance of book-making. Nor does the reader feel much confidence that he has Southey's real opinions on many subjects, even after going through his voluminous correspondence as now edited by his son. There are frequent blanks and omissions, particularly in the letters on political subjects, which are sufficiently significant to those who are acquainted with the changes in Southey's views during the course of his long life; and on many points the narrative is meagre and imperfect. Of the various letters here given, the most important and valuable are the autobiographical letters written to Mr. John May, between 1820 and 1825, occupying, indeed, only about half of the first volume, but curious and instructive from the pictures of his childhood and youth which they present. As a letter-writer, Southey can hardly be placed in the first rank. His earlier letters are such as any young man of ordinary parts might have written; but as he grew older and his mind matured, they become more worthy of attention, and many of them possess great merit. Yet their general character may best be described in his own language in a letter to one of his most constant correspondents. "My letters," he writes, "like Gibbon's sentences, all go to one tune, and would furnish as pretty specimens of egotism as the memoirs of P. P."* This is perfectly true; and if the present editor had omitted a large part of the letters which he has published, and given us more of his own recollections of his father, more information in regard to the change in his father's opinions, more detail respecting his father's friends and contemporaries, his labors would have been entitled to a more respectful consideration. But as it is, the life of Robert Southey still remains to be written. It is, however, to this work that all future biographers must resort for a considerable portion of their materials.

In reviewing the life of Southey, the principal difficulty arises from its lack of moral unity. During his progress from youth to manhood, his opinions on nearly every political and religious question underwent a thorough and radical change; and it seems almost impossible to discover any general principle running through his life.

* *Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich, Vol. I. p. 521.*

around which his different and antagonistic views can be grouped so as to show their mutual relation and dependence. In Southey's case it is in vain to look for any clearly defined system of opinions resting on well-established logical convictions. Hence the ordinary arguments by which inconsistency may be explained, and even justified, do not meet the difficulty. It is not enough to say, that no man retains precisely the same opinions through life, and that even so wise and excellent a man as Sir James Mackintosh did not always adhere to the doctrines promulgated in the *Vindiciæ Gallicæ*, and was at one time regarded as an apostate by his own friends. It is not to be desired that any man should at all times and under all circumstances uphold the same abstract opinions with the same unbending firmness. This is particularly true in regard to statesmen. The man who pledges himself to a particular line of policy, and ignores all considerations of expediency, is utterly unworthy to be intrusted with the management of public affairs. Accordingly, we find that Earl Grey, perhaps the most upright and consistent statesman that England produced during the last generation, died with opinions somewhat modified from those with which he set out in early life. But this argument is not broad enough to embrace so wide a departure from first principles as we witness in Southey.

Neither will it be sufficient to show that he lived in a period of unexampled disorder and change, when all old institutions and opinions seemed everywhere to be giving place to new systems and ideas. Yet, as Southey's mind was always subjective rather than objective, it cannot be doubted that great weight should be attached to this argument. But even this does not fully meet the requirements of the case. So far as we now know, not one of Southey's contemporaries who was not also a poet went through so thorough a recantation. Not one of them changed his religious belief when he left the popular party and ranged himself on the side of prerogative. And though it is doubtless true, as Lord Brougham remarks, that "it would, indeed, be difficult to select one leading principle or prevailing sentiment in Mr. Burke's latest writings, to which something extremely adverse may not be found in his former, we can hardly say his early,

works, — excepting only on the subject of Parliamentary Reform, to which, with all the friends of Lord Rockingham, he was from the beginning adverse";* yet even he changed less than Southey. It is true that he quarrelled with those friends by whose side he had stood all through the American war, broke all personal and party ties, tore away from all the associations of the past, and planted himself on the extremest Tory ground; but he had never cherished the seditious principles of Wat Tyler, and never went beyond the subserviency of The Vision of Judgment.

If, then, we can explain Southey's changes neither on the ground of natural growth as his mind ripened, nor by a reference to the disturbed period in which he lived, we must seek elsewhere for their explanation. We must look for it in his own mind, — in his peculiar intellectual constitution. Now, a careful analysis of his mental processes shows certain results which, we conceive, fully satisfy the inquiry. His opinions appear to have entered his mind through the imagination, and not through the logical faculties. They grew out of his prejudices, rather than from his convictions. In truth, he does not seem to have been fitted either by nature or education to follow out a close and sustained argument, to weigh conflicting testimony, or compare the results of actual experiment. He possessed considerable fancy and imagination, though not of the highest order; but of that noble inductive method which Lord Bacon taught, he had no knowledge. His arguments were all addressed *ad hominem*, as in his essays on Catholic Emancipation, — the very idea of which frightened him almost as much as it did George the Third, — and, in fact, wherever argument was required. He had read almost every thing in general literature; but he had thought little. Hence his dislike of political economy, of the very first principles of which he was profoundly ignorant, even while he attempted to write upon it, and also of the exact sciences, with most of which he was equally unacquainted. In short, Southey adopted whatever opinions he at any time cherished because they pleased his imagination, and not because he believed them from any sufficient reason. In a similar way we

* Statesmen of the Time of George the Third.

can explain the eccentricities of Burke's splendid but erratic career. The recent conversions to Romanism and Puseyism, both in this country and in England, are likewise illustrations of the same principle. They have mainly taken place in persons of a fervid imagination morbidly excited by some external cause, who, while in that unreasoning state, have been brought into contact with the arrogant pretensions which Rome holds out, or the hardly less arrogant pretensions of the Tractarian writers. Persons whose intellects have been sharpened and toughened by dialectical practice are not liable to give up their opinions from such causes; but the young and romantic, and those of quick and lively sensibilities, will always be vulnerable by whatever touches their imaginations.

As would naturally be inferred, Southey was intolerant towards all who differed with him in opinion, and was one of the most virulent of partisan writers. No man ever treated his opponents with greater unfairness, or exhibited a more unrelenting hostility towards those who adhered to the opinions which he had himself laid aside. Of Lord Jeffrey, in particular, he was accustomed to write and speak in the most bitter and objurgatory terms. To William Taylor, he wrote that Jeffrey was "a mere child upon that subject [taste]; I never met with a man whom it was so easy to checkmate."* In another letter, alluding to Lord Jeffrey's review of Mr. Taylor's translation of *Nathan the Wise*, he says, — "I knew the man wrote like a coxcomb; still there was a sort of gentlemanly decorum, from which he did not think himself exempted, and this he has broken through."† A reference to the article in question shows the absurdity of this; ‡ and even Mr. Taylor himself was compelled to notice it. "I agree with Jeffrey," he says in his reply to Southey's letter, "in most things about 'Nathan,' and am well satisfied with his reviewal."§ At a subsequent period we are told, that "of Judge Jeffrey of the *Edinburgh Review* I must ever think and speak as of a bad politician, a worse moralist, and a critic, in matters of

* *Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich*, Vol. II. p. 102.

† *Ibid.*, Vol. II. p. 129.

‡ *Edinburgh Review*, for April, 1806.

§ *Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich*, Vol. II. p. 135.

taste, equally incompetent and unjust."* Speaking of Sydney Smith, he exclaims, — "It were better to be a fanatic than such a buffoon as this, for fanaticism implies some feeling, some sincerity, some heart of flesh and blood."† Mrs. Barbauld he mentions under a coarse and degrading *soubriquet*; ‡ and of the younger Pitt he rarely, if ever, speaks in respectful terms. § Those statesmen whose measures he disapproved were stigmatized as "most miserable ministers," || "men of tried and convicted incapacity," ¶ and as deficient even in "good intentions."** These extracts are taken almost at random from his familiar correspondence with his friends; but they are sufficient for our present purpose. They show how Southey habitually regarded and spoke of those who maintained different views from his own on the moral, political, and literary questions of the day. Additional illustrations will occur as we proceed, both from his published writings and from his letters. In the present instance, however, we have purposely confined our citations to the latter; since, as a general rule, a man's true character is much more likely to be revealed in the daily business of life, or the frankness of friendly communication, than in productions designed for popular effect. Taking these facts and considerations along with us in the discussion, we propose now to lay before our readers a rapid sketch of Southey's life and opinions, with such incidental observations on his different works as our limits may allow.

Robert Southey was the second son of respectable parents in the middling walks of life, and was born at Bristol, on the 12th of August, 1774. At the age of three he was sent to school to make acquaintance with the mysteries of the alphabet, and to be kept out of harm's way; for he was too young to learn much except the merest rudiments of knowledge. He remained at this school until he was six, living for most of the time

* Letter to Sir Walter Scott, December 8, 1807.

† Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich, Vol. II. p. 232.

‡ Letter to S. T. Coleridge, March 14, 1804.

§ Letters, *passim*.

|| Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich, Vol. I. p. 467.

¶ Letter to Grosvenor C. Bedford, Esq., May 5, 1807; and Letters, *passim*.

** Letter to C. H. Townsend, February 16, 1817.

with his aunt, Miss Tyler, a maiden lady of scrupulous neatness, but with many whimsical and uncomfortable notions. "I had many indulgences," says Southey, "but more privations, and those of an injurious kind; want of playmates, want of exercise, never being allowed to do any thing in which by possibility I might dirt myself; late hours in company, that is to say, late hours for a child, which I reckon among the privations (having always had the healthiest propensity for going to bed betimes); late hours of rising, which were less painful, perhaps, but in other respects worse."* His aunt was particularly fond of dramatic entertainments, and took him to the theatre when he was only four years old. After that he was frequently her companion, even before he was old enough to understand what he saw. Under such a pernicious system of mismanagement, it need not surprise us, that his imagination should have become injuriously affected, and in after years have usurped the place of the reasoning powers.

When he was six years old he was first permitted to wear boy's clothes, and sent to a school kept by a man; but he had only been here a year when the master died. He was next sent to Corston, nine miles from Bristol, where he passed another year, "with little profit and with a good deal of suffering." At length, and fortunately for him, the head-master and his son quarrelled, and came to blows; upon which the child was removed to a fourth school, at Bristol, under a Welsh master. But he added scarce any thing to his knowledge here. When not in school, where his training seems to have been poorly conducted, he spent most of his time in reading miscellaneous works, writing plays, hearing and talking about the theatre, and in similar employments. In Latin, and the common English branches, he appears to have made tolerable progress. In dancing, however, he was a sorry pupil; and the fiddle-bow was as often applied to his head as to the strings when he was called out. When not kicking the master, which was not unfrequently practised, he went through the lesson with a dogged determination of never dancing again after he had once made his escape from the school. Forty years

* Autobiographical Letter, April 7, 1821.

afterwards he tells us he had piously kept the determination to that hour.*

After leaving this school, he was for a short time the pupil of a clergyman named Lewis, who taught him the rudiments of Greek, and accustomed him to compose in prose and verse; and under whom he improved rapidly. In 1788, he was taken up to London, for the first time, by his aunt, and entered the high school at Westminster. Here his time was pleasantly and profitably passed until the spring of 1792, when he was expelled on account of an act of culpable indiscretion on his part, which gives early evidence of his tendency to use strong and bitter language. Fired by the brilliant success of Canning and the Etonians in the *Microcosm*, Southey and some of his friends at Westminster essayed to imitate it in a periodical called *The Flagellant*. Four numbers only had been published, when he wrote and inserted a letter ridiculing and attacking the system of corporal punishment which formed a part of the discipline of the school. Dr. Vincent, the head-master, was at once aroused by this attack on his authority, and commenced a suit against the publisher of the paper. Nor did the storm blow over until Southey was compelled to leave the school.

News of this affair soon reached Oxford, and caused his rejection at Christ Church College; but he was at length entered of Baliol College, on the 21st of October, 1792. It is not easy to determine what was the exact state of his opinions when he went to Oxford. It does not, indeed, seem probable that a boy of eighteen, brought up as he had been, should have had any well defined or firmly established views. But as he had already been expelled from school in consequence of giving utterance to opinions deemed subversive of that just authority without which no school can be carried on, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he was beginning to entertain those loose and anarchical sentiments which he soon afterwards held, and which are found in most of the early productions of his pen. Within a month after he entered Oxford, he asks, in a letter to a friend,—“Is it not rather disgraceful, at the moment when Europe is on fire with

* Autobiographical Letter, May 27, 1824.

freedom, — when man and monarch are contending, — to sit and study Euclid or Hugo Grotius ?” * A year after this he completed *Joan of Arc*, as first published, and a few months later wrote *Wat Tyler*. The difference between these two poems doubtless shows the progress of his opinions. His imagination had become excited by dwelling on the abstract rights of man, the natural sovereignty of the people, and the duty of resisting unjust government; and even the uncongenial atmosphere of Oxford could not cool his ardor. In truth, most of his time at college was spent in meditating on the patriots of Greece and Rome, devising new schemes of social reform, and writing seditious poetry, to the great neglect of those studies which he ought rather to have pursued. “The more I see of this strange world,” he writes, “the more I am convinced that society requires desperate remedies.” † At the same time, his mind was filled with sad forebodings for the future destiny of the race, as he pictured to himself what he considered was its actual condition. “I look round the world,” he exclaims, “and everywhere find the same mournful spectacle, — the strong tyrannizing over the weak, man and beast. The same depravity pervades the whole creation; oppression is triumphant everywhere, and the only difference is, that it acts in Turkey through the anger of a grand seignior, in France of a revolutionary tribunal, and in England of a prime minister. There is no place for virtue.” ‡ From this misanthropic state his mind was aroused by the bright vision of Pantisocracy, of which we shall presently speak in another connection.

But not only did Southey pass through a strange and sad experience in regard to his political opinions whilst at college. His religious opinions were in an equally unsettled state. It is certain that at one time he held opinions in some degree approximating to those cherished by the great body of Unitarians; but it is not less certain, that they rested on no sufficient basis, and were loosely held. Indeed, Southey was mentally incompetent to weigh the arguments on which a belief in those views of Scriptural truth that we maintain must rest.

* Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., November 20, 1792.

† Letter to Horace Bedford, Esq., December 22, 1793.

‡ Letter to Grosvenor C. Bedford, Esq., November 11, 1793.

As we have already shown, he was in the habit of looking at every thing through the imagination; and this was precisely the case in respect to his religious beliefs. He was temporarily struck with the simplicity and grandeur of our doctrines concerning God and Christ and man, without for a moment noticing how they accord with Scripture and reason; and he became a Unitarian. His faith rested on his imagination; and as his opinions became more and more subversive of all human government, he readily exchanged his *quasi* Unitarianism for views more in accordance with his political notions. He fell into atheistical ways of thinking, and approached the verge of actual unbelief. He had entered college with the intention of taking orders in the Church of England; but her doctrines were now so repugnant to him, that he speedily gave up this intention. And though he was in after years among the foremost to advocate her claims, he appears never to have fully given his assent to her tenets.

With the mental habits which he had brought with him to Oxford, and with his mind already so full of crude speculations, it is obvious that he would not profit much by the course of studies pursued at the English Universities, since it is addressed to an entirely different set of faculties from those which he had hitherto cultivated. "Of all the months in my life (happily they did not amount to years)," he writes to a college friend, "those which were passed at Oxford were the most unprofitable. What Greek I took there I literally left there, and could not help losing; and all I learned was a little swimming (very little the worse luck) and a little boating, which is greatly improved, now that I have a boat of my own upon this delightful lake."* He had hardly been at college three months when he wrote, — "Never shall child of mine enter a public school or a university."† This intention he partially carried out in the case of his two sons; but the eldest died before the experiment was fully tried, and the second was sent to college at the usual age, to prepare for the Church. It was doubtless the unsatisfactory result obtained in his own case, with a knowledge

* Letter to Rev. Nicholas Lightfoot, April 24, 1807.

† Letter to Grosvenor C. Bedford, Esq., March 16, 1793.

of the demoralizing influences which he had himself witnessed, that led him to try the effect of domestic education on the children whom he loved with such a depth of tenderness as is rarely seen. At college his mind vacillated between each of the three learned professions, as they are called; and to each he at one time or another devoted his chief attention. He, however, gained little positive benefit from his study of them, and experienced considerable mental exercise as they severally became distasteful to him.

Southey did not remain long at Oxford. In June, 1794, he first became acquainted with Samuel Taylor Coleridge; and this acquaintance was to change the whole tenor of his life. Coleridge was his senior by two years, and like him had adopted liberal principles both in politics and religion, though he had not gone quite as far in the latter as Southey. They soon formed a close friendship, founded on mutual admiration; and before long Coleridge proceeded to unfold his scheme of Pantisocracy to his new friend and admirer. Southey's mind was ripe for the plan, as he had already conceived the idea of emigrating to America; and his enthusiasm was at once kindled to the height. "The thoughts of the day and the visions of the night," he writes to his brother, "all centre in America."* And a month later he adds, — "This Pantisocratic scheme has given me new life, new hope, new energy; all the faculties of my mind are dilated; I am weeding out the few lurking prejudices of habit, and looking forward to happiness. I wish I could transfuse some of my high hope and enthusiasm into you; it would warm you in the cold winter nights."† Every thing was progressing finely, when his aunt heard of the scheme, and of Southey's intended marriage; and neither piece of information was at all calculated to conciliate her good-will. Her anger was fiercely excited, and she declared she would never see him again, nor open any letter which he might send her; and ended by turning him out of doors, penniless and on a wet night. This did not dishearten him; and it was only when it became evident that sufficient money could not be obtained to

* Letter to Thomas Southey, Esq., September 20, 1794.

† Letter to the same, October 14, 1794.

transport the party to this country, that the execution of the plan was postponed. It had been their original design, to form an association of married men of studious habits and moderate means, who were to unite in the purchase of a tract of land to be owned in common, and cultivated by their joint labor, while they should occupy separate dwellings, and employ their leisure in social conversation and literary pursuits. Finding it impossible to carry out this purpose in its original grandeur amidst the wilds of Pennsylvania, as was at one time proposed, Southey suggested the expediency of trying it upon a smaller scale in Wales; but his suggestion was deemed impracticable, and the whole scheme was soon after given up.

The want of money now began to weigh heavily on Southey; and early in 1795 he commenced a course of historical lectures at Bristol, in order to raise a supply for his current expenses. Of these lectures no traces remain among his papers; but they appear to have been well attended, and to have added something to his pecuniary resources. About the same time he sold his first volume of poems for thirty guineas to Mr. Cottle, a Bristol bookseller, who proved a kind and generous friend to him, and who soon after purchased *Joan of Arc* for fifty guineas. Still Southey's means were scanty indeed, and he was wholly dependent on Mr. Cottle for his daily subsistence. "Your house," he says in a letter to Mr. Cottle, "was my house when I had no other. The very money with which I bought my wedding ring, and paid my marriage fees, was supplied by you. It was with your sisters that I left my Edith, during my six months' absence; and for the six months after my return, it was from you that I received, week by week, the little on which we lived, till I was enabled to live by other means."* It was under these circumstances that Southey was privately married to Miss Edith Fricker, a sister of Coleridge's wife, on the 14th of November, 1795, when he had but just entered on his twenty-second year. This marriage, however, which was thus clouded at its commencement, was eminently a happy one for both parties; and in all the domestic relations Southey was irreproachable, while his

* Cottle's Reminiscences of S. T. Coleridge and R. Southey, pp. ix., x.

wife proved worthy of such a husband. Soon after his marriage he writes, — "Surely a man does not do his duty who leaves his wife to evenings of solitude, and I feel duty and happiness to be inseparable. I am happier at home than any other society can possibly make me." * On this subject his views appear never to have changed through life. Twenty years later, his own experience of matrimony had been so pleasant as to induce him to congratulate a friend, who was on the eve of marrying, in most emphatic language. "I am glad," he says, "to hear that you have taken your chance for happiness in that state in which alone there is a chance of finding it." †

Southey's friends had been much opposed to his engagement with Miss Fricker, and had endeavoured to break off what they regarded as an unwise attachment. Accordingly, his uncle, the Rev. Herbert Hill, invited him to reside with him at Lisbon for a time, in order that absence might weaken his affection, and that a healthy influence might change his political and religious views. The first purpose, as we have seen, signally failed; and Southey took leave of his wife at the church door when he started from Bristol to accompany his uncle on their foreign journey. He only remained abroad six months; and gladly returned to England, in the spring of 1796. But during this time he had gained some knowledge of Portuguese and Spanish literature, which afterwards proved of great service to him, and laid the foundation for his very thorough acquaintance with the languages and literatures of those nations. His uncle's opinion of him is curious and striking. In a letter to a friend, after enumerating the young man's good qualities, he adds, — "In short, he has every thing you would wish a young man to have, excepting common sense or prudence." ‡ This opinion had much of truth in it, and shows how clearly his uncle perceived Southey's want of practical talent.

Upon his return to England, Southey took up his abode at Bristol, and passed most of his time in preparing a volume of Letters from Spain and Portugal for the

* Letter to Joseph Cottle, February, 1797.

† Letter to John Taylor Coleridge, Esq., September 8, 1818.

‡ *Life and Correspondence*, Vol. I. p. 274.

press, and in writing for the *Monthly Magazine*. His mind was now fixed on the law as a profession; but no man was ever less fitted for legal studies, and we are not at all surprised that it should seem to him nothing better than "a horrid jargon,—a quibbling collection of voluminous nonsense." * He, however, went up to London early in 1797, and entered himself of Gray's Inn; but he kept his terms with little regularity, and was continually threatening to burn his law books. Finally, after his return from his second residence in Portugal, little more is said of the law; and even before he went abroad the second time, he appears to have given up all thought of rising to distinction in that way, or even of obtaining a livelihood by it. Henceforth literature was to be his sole profession, and, resigning all idea of becoming a clergyman, a physician, or a lawyer, he determined to be "a writer of books," a phrase by which Mr. Carlyle once described himself. To this business he devoted himself with a zeal and perseverance which have never been surpassed, and rarely equalled. His son gives a list of his writings, embracing forty-five publications in book form, besides about a hundred articles in the *Quarterly Review*, and numberless papers and essays in other periodicals, of which no record remains.

Early in the spring of 1800, he made his second visit to the Peninsula, partly for the sake of his health, and partly for the purpose of obtaining materials for a proposed *History of Portugal*. He was accompanied by his wife, and remained abroad until June, 1801, residing chiefly at Cintra, a pleasant little place not far from Lisbon, and occasionally travelling through the country. Here he was contented and happy; but the city itself did not please him, and its filthy condition doubtless strengthened his deep and habitual dislike of an urban residence. "Lisbon," he writes to his brother, "has twice been clean since the creation. Noah's flood washed it once, and the fire after the earthquake purified it. When it will be clean again will be difficult to say; probably not till the general conflagration." † It, however, afforded him the means of acquiring a knowledge of the history of Portu-

* Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., November 21, 1796.

† Letter to Lieutenant Southey, May 23, 1800.

guese literature; and his time was fully occupied in his literary labors. Whilst in Portugal, he published the first edition of *Thalaba*, a long and irregular poem founded on the peculiarities of the Mahometan faith, and somewhat defective both in the plan and execution, but containing passages of great and manifest beauty. Long before this he had formed the plan of *Madoc*, and made some progress in its composition; and it was now resumed, and continued at intervals, when no other work interfered with its progress.

Southey returned to England entirely recovered in health, but somewhat reluctant to leave the soft climate of the South for "the rains, and the fogs, and the frosts" of his native land; and finally took a lease of Greta Hall, Keswick, a few miles only from Wordsworth's house, where he continued to reside until his death. Soon after his return, and before his removal to Keswick, he was offered the appointment of private secretary to Mr. Corry, Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland, with a salary of about seventeen hundred dollars. He accepted the appointment, and proceeded immediately to Dublin; but he soon became dissatisfied with it, threw up the office, and returned home in disgust. About the same time he lost his mother, to whom he was tenderly attached; and the shock which her death occasioned doubtless conspired to render his official position still more disagreeable, and make him long for the comforts of a settled residence. Whilst he was still undecided on this point, he entered into a negotiation for a house in South Wales; but the arrangement was never completed, and at the earnest solicitation of Mr. Coleridge, who then resided there, he removed to Keswick in the beginning of September, 1803. Here he had abundant time to devote to his literary pursuits, and to plan new works, many of which were never to be executed. Besides the works of which mention has already been made, he had published an abridgment of *Amadis of Gaul*, a new edition of *Chatterton's Works*, and two volumes of the *Annual Anthology*; and he was now meditating the *History of Portugal*, a gigantic *Bibliotheca Britannica*, and *Madoc*. Of these plans *Madoc* alone was completed. The *Bibliotheca* was given up in consequence of its size, and he did not live to finish the *Portuguese History*, though it occupied his thoughts as

long as his mind retained any of its original powers. Southey was always much given to planning publications which were never executed, and the number of such abortive schemes mentioned in his letters is very large. Yet, as we have already intimated, he was one of the most industrious and punctual of men; and few authors have left behind them such an amount of printed matter, to say nothing of his manuscripts and letters.

In 1805, he published *Madoc*, which had been in preparation for more than fifteen years, and prefaced it with the following characteristic lines:—

“Come, listen to a tale of times of old!
 Come, for ye know me. I am he who sang
 The Maid of Arc, and I am he who framed
 Of Thalaba the wild and wondrous song.
 Come, listen to my lay, and ye shall hear
 How Madoc from the shores of Britain spread
 The adventurous sail, explored the ocean paths,
 And quelled barbarian power, and overthrew
 The bloody altars of Idolatry,
 And planted in its fanes triumphantly
 The cross of Christ. Come, listen to my lay!”

But the public were not disposed to heed this gentle invitation; for though in several letters written about the time of its publication he speaks of its being greatly admired and selling rapidly, he afterwards writes to Mr. Taylor,—“My profits upon this poem in the course of twelve months amount precisely to three pounds, seventeen shillings, and one penny. In the same space of time Walter Scott has sold 4,500 copies of his ‘Lay,’ and netted, of course, above a thousand pounds.”* The unfavorable opinion which these facts imply has been confirmed by a subsequent generation; and the poem is now but little read, and has few admirers even among those who entertain the highest opinion in regard to Southey’s genius. Southey himself, however, had a very different notion of its merit, and was well satisfied that it was the best poem which had been published since *Paradise Lost*.† In the same year he published his *Metrical Tales* and other Poems, comprising the best of his minor pieces. It was in these shorter poems, we conceive, that his poetical powers are exhibited to the best advantage; and it is by them and by extracts from his more elaborate productions,

* *Memoir of William Taylor, of Norwich*, Vol. II. p. 124.

† *Letter to Lieutenant Southey*, December 7, 1805.

we believe, that he is most likely to be remembered as a poet.

His opinions were now beginning to change from what they had been whilst he was at college, and to assume the character which they bore during his middle life. But they were still somewhat unsettled, and when the Fox and Grenville administration came in, in 1806, we find him writing, — "I was ministerial under Addington, regarded his successor [Pitt] with the utmost indignation, and am exceedingly well pleased at the present changes. Time, you say, moderates opinions as it mellows wine. My views and hopes are certainly altered, though the heart and soul of my wishes continue the same. It is the world that has changed, not I."* In another letter, the reference to which we have accidentally mislaid, he tells us that his later opinions were "developed" from those which he held in early life. If we except the development theory of the writer of *The Vestiges of Creation*, nothing is so absurd as this idea with which Southey flattered himself. There is no natural or logical connection between the views which he held at any one time and those which he held at another time. But while his mind was thus busy with politics, it was not idle on other subjects. At this time he was engaged on the *History of Portugal*, *The Chronicle of the Cid*, *The Curse of Kehama*, and *Espriella's Letters*; and, besides devoting much time to these, he made several short journeys during the year, to Edinburgh, London, and other parts of the country.

Notwithstanding Southey's intolerance of those who differed with him in opinion, he manifested great kindness in all the relations of private life; and few persons have ever shown greater inclination to aid young men of talent who were struggling against adverse fortune. In 1804, he had become interested in the poems of Henry Kirke White; and upon the death of that amiable and unfortunate young man, he readily entered into an arrangement to edit his works and prepare a sketch of his life. This was to him a labor of love, though he had little or no sympathy with White's religious opinions; and from it arose a close friendship with the young poet's two brothers, to whom many of the letters in the present

* Letter to the Rev. Nicholas Lightfoot, February 8, 1806.

volumes are addressed. The work was received with great favor, and, like all his biographies, was admirably arranged, and written with great eloquence and beauty. In subsequent years we find him helping many other young poets of promise; but for none does he seem to have entertained the same regard as for young White. It is a somewhat curious coincidence, that when he was in Bristol for a short time, not many months after he had prepared his edition of Kirke White's *Literary Remains*, he should have met with Mr. Walter Savage Landor, the man he "was most desirous of meeting," and that the encouragement which he received from that gentleman should have led him to take up poetry again when he had almost determined to forego its composition.*

In the spring of 1809, the *Quarterly Review* was set up by the Tories, to counteract the powerful influence of the *Edinburgh Review*; and Southey, who had refused to contribute to the latter on account of his dislike of its politics, immediately became one of the principal contributors to the new journal. But it is well known that Mr. Gifford, its conductor, exercised his right of editorial supervision with unwarrantable severity; and many years after its commencement Southey complains that not one of his articles was published without mutilation. We have taken the pains to look through nearly all of the articles contributed by him at different times; and it is our deliberate judgment, that a higher idea of his powers may be obtained from them than from any of his prose works, except his biographies. They cannot, indeed, be compared with the matchless essays of Lord Jeffrey and Mr. Macaulay; but with the exception of those papers which are designed to be argumentative, or which are levelled against his opponents, they possess great merit. They embrace a wide range of subjects, but are mostly biographical and historical, or reviews of books of travel; and are written in that clear and graceful style which always makes his prose so delightful. They all show that wonderful extent of reading which he had somehow managed to go over; and we believe there are not more than ten or twelve from which some curious fact of general interest or value may not be

* Letters, *passim*.

drawn. In bestowing this praise, it is necessary to exclude the political and controversial articles. They are marked by the fiercest intolerance, and are utterly worthless as arguments in favor of the cause which they uphold. Nor was this cause one in the success of which any friend of free institutions could rejoice.

In August of the same year he undertook the historical part of the Edinburgh Annual Register, with an annual salary of £ 400. In this work he expressed his opinions with so much virulence, that the Edinburgh Reviewers, who were not at all reluctant to attack him, recommended it for government prosecution; and at one time it was probable that this recommendation would be acted upon. The work, however, proved to be so unprofitable a speculation for its proprietors, and there was so much irregularity in the payment of his salary, that he withdrew from it at the end of three years, — much to his pecuniary disadvantage; for during his connection with it he seems to have been more profitably employed than at any other time in his life. The Quarterly Review, too, paid him liberally for his contributions; and from these and other sources he was in receipt of a very considerable income, though by no means so large as was believed by many of his contemporaries. In the midst of these various occupations, he still found time for poetry; and before one poem was fairly through the press, another was commenced. In fact, he seldom had fewer than three or four works in progress at the same time. "I am one of those lucky people," he says in one of his letters, "who find their business their amusement, and contrive to do more by having half a dozen things in hand at once, than if employed upon any single one of them."* With this view, he divided the working hours of each day between the several books which he was then writing; and so habituated himself to this division of time, that he could pass from history to poetry or criticism without the slightest difficulty. He thus kept all his time constantly occupied, and accomplished an amount of mental labor which it would have been impossible for him to perform in any other way.

His next publication was the first volume of the His-

* Letter to John Rickman, Esq., January 21, 1810.

tory of Brazil, a ponderous work in three quarto volumes, which has long been forgotten, but of which he himself had an immoderately high opinion. In one of his letters, after expatiating on the character of the work, he remarks,—"I should deal insincerely with you if I did not add, that ages hence it will be found among those works which are not destined to perish, and secure for me a remembrance in other countries as well as in my own; that it will be read in the heart of South America, and communicate to the Brazilians, when they shall have become a powerful nation, much of their own history which would otherwise have perished, and be to them what the work of Herodotus is to Europe."* Such was Southey's opinion, as expressed in a letter which his son has published; but whether his son entertains the same opinion does not appear. About the same time he published *The Curse of Kehama*, the wildest and most extravagant of all his poems, in which he endeavoured to weave the charm of poetry around the Hindoo mythology, but with very doubtful success. Nor does it seem probable that the poem will ever obtain a more favorable reception than it met with on its first appearance. His next publication, however, was more successful. This was the *Life of Nelson*, which is almost universally regarded as the best of his prose works, and will undoubtedly be read as long as the name of its hero shall be held in honor by Englishmen. Indeed, we know of no other biography which has had so many readers and admirers among all classes.

Upon the death of Mr. Pye, in the summer of 1813, he was offered the appointment of poet laureate, which after some delay he accepted. But he did nothing to elevate the character of an office which had already sunk below contempt; and the Edinburgh Reviewers were justified by the facts when they declared that "his Laureate Odes are utterly and intolerably bad, and, if he had never written any thing else, must have ranked him below Colley Cibber in genius, and above him in conceit and presumption."† The first on the list of these abject productions was the *Carmen Triumphale*, which the same witty

* Letter to C. H. Townsend, Esq., July 20, 1819.

† Edinburgh Review, for January, 1816.

essayists happily described as "a strange farrago of bad psalmody and stupid newspapers." * Even this, however, was better than some of his later poems; and fortunately for his reputation, the same year witnessed the publication of *Roderick*, in every respect the best of his poems, and a work of no common merit and beauty. Of this he was himself conscious. "You have in *Roderick*," he writes, "the best which I have done, and probably the best that I shall do, which is rather a melancholy feeling for the author." †

After the battle of Waterloo had put an end to the war which had been waged so long and at so great a cost to England, Southey fell in with the common current of his countrymen, and went over to the Continent. On his return, he published *The Poet's Pilgrimage to Waterloo*, — a work of no great merit, for while the first part contains several beautiful passages, the whole is little better than a mere party pamphlet. The temper of mind in which it was composed will best be shown by an extract from a letter written immediately after his return. Alluding to the feelings abroad in relation to Bonaparte, he says he found "a very proper degree of disappointment and indignation that he had not been put to death as he deserved, — a feeling in which I heartily concurred." ‡ But domestic sorrow soon checked the utterance of these amiable wishes. On the 17th of April, 1816, he lost his only son, Herbert, a fine boy of ten, on whom he had lavished his choicest affections; and for a time he could hardly bear up under the bereavement. His letters are full of mournful allusions to his loss. "My spirits," he writes, "do not recover: that they should again be what they have been, I do not expect; that, indeed, is impossible." § From this state of despondency he roused himself sufficiently to complete *The Lay of the Laureate*, a nuptial poem written on occasion of the marriage of the Princess Charlotte. In one of his letters he tells us that this poem had not derived "the slightest cast of coloring" from his existing state of mind; || but

* *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1814.

† Letter to Dr. Gooch, November 30, 1814.

‡ Letter to Sir Walter Scott, March 17, 1816.

§ Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., May 15, 1816.

|| Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., April 30, 1816.

the evidence on the face of the poem itself is so strong, that we can hardly believe it was not insensibly colored by his own experience.

His opinions on political and religious questions had now hardened into ultra Toryism and High Churchism; and though this remarkable change had excited the fiercest animosity of the friends of liberal principles in government, it had been hailed with delight by the disciples and followers of Mr. Perceval and Lord Eldon. In consequence of the satisfaction with which they regarded it, Lord Liverpool, in the following summer, intimated a wish that he would go up to London and confer with the ministry. Their object appears to have been, to set up a journal of which Southey should be editor, and which should be devoted to the support of their administration. After a little hesitancy he declined to assume the charge of any paper; but expressed a willingness to write a book on the state of the nation. The work, however, was never published, though a considerable amount of materials was collected. Soon after this he was a good deal annoyed by the surreptitious publication of *Wat Tyler*, and by an attack made upon him on the floor of Parliament by William Smith, Esq., of Norwich, who declared that the poem "appeared to him to be the most seditious book that was ever written." Lord Brougham had previously alluded to it, and called the attention of the Attorney-General to the principles contained in it; but Mr. Smith did not confine his remarks to the book in question. He made a more direct attack on Southey, contrasted the sentiments in *Wat Tyler* with the sentiments contained in his later works, and commented with great severity on his tergiversations. This attack called forth a fierce and bitter reply, in a Letter to William Smith, Esq., M. P., in which Southey defended the book, and explained his views at considerable length, concluding in a strain of ridiculous and contemptible egotism, by predicting that his own name and works would be immortal, while his opponent would only be remembered as "a certain Mr. William Smith."* He also applied to the Court of Chancery for an injunction upon the publication and sale of the book; but Lord

* Vol. IV., Appendix.

Eldon refused it, on the ground that the work was a seditious publication, and therefore the author could have no title in it.

About the same time he received a proposition to write the leading editorials in the London Times, which he promptly declined; and soon after made another short excursion to the Continent by way of relaxation from his labors. His next important publication was *The Life of Wesley*, an elegant and graceful biography, but written from a High Church point of view. This was followed, in 1821, by *A Vision of Judgment*, a wretched apotheosis of George the Third in hexameters, which even the present editor finds it difficult to defend against the charge of blasphemy. Few persons, indeed, except George the Fourth, to whom it was dedicated, have been found who could either read or admire it; but that monarch sent word to Southey, that he had read it twice, "and was well pleased with it."* In the preface to it, Southey had taken occasion to assail the writings of Lord Byron and his imitators, describing them as the Satanic school in literature, and indulging in many other opprobrious epithets. To this attack Lord Byron replied with biting sarcasm, in an angry and contemptuous parody likewise called *The Vision of Judgment*; and a fierce quarrel arose between them, which was only terminated with death. Southey next published the first volume of an elaborate and tedious *History of the Peninsular War*, which had ceased to be read even before the appearance of Colonel Napier's fascinating volumes, and has now completely vanished from sight. Close upon this came the *Book of the Church*, which, standing by the side of *A Vision of Judgment*, indicates the extreme point his opinions had now reached. It contains, amidst much trash, considerable curious and interesting matter which is worth separating from the bigoted and puerile arguments that overlay it. It was attacked by Charles Butler, the most eminent Roman Catholic writer then living in England, and defended by Southey in a second publication, entitled *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.

In the spring of 1825, he went to Holland, and was for some time the guest of Mr. Bilderdijk, at Leyden,

* Letter to Rev. Nicholas Lightfoot, June 2, 1821.

whose wife had translated Roderick into Dutch. In 1826, during a second visit to the same kind friends, he was chosen member of Parliament from Downton, a nomination borough in the gift of Lord Radnor; but he wisely declined the proffered honor. He himself well knew that he was totally unfitted both by nature and education to appear to advantage amid the turmoil of party strife. "You are right," he says, "in supposing that I should have made a bad statesman, and you may add to it that for no one line of life should I have been well qualified except for the clerical profession."* Nevertheless, in 1829, he determined to enter the lists of partisan warfare, and published his *Colloquies on Society*, which were mercilessly ridiculed and controverted by Mr. Macaulay, in one of the ablest articles ever written by him. During the progress of the Reform Bill, he appears to have been greatly exercised in mind; for he had long entertained a notion that "Parliamentary Reform is the shortest road to anarchy." † His letters at this time are full of dire prophecies and lamentations over the weakness and wickedness of Earl Grey's ministry; and there was doubtless a feeling of triumph when he wrote, a few months after the bill had passed,— "It is already apparent that the reformed Parliament will not work." ‡

The Whig ministry, however, notwithstanding their dislike of his politics, had treated him with great consideration; and soon after Lord Brougham took office, Southey received a polite letter from him inviting him to give his views in relation to the best means by which government could encourage literary and scientific pursuits. To this letter Southey replied with cold civility; and as the Chancellor became more and more engaged in his law reforms, the matter appears to have been entirely forgotten. In the mean time Southey had completed the *History of the Peninsular War*, and published two small volumes of poetry, besides preparing the *Lives of Uneducated Poets*, prefixed to a volume of poems by an old household servant in whom he was much interested, the *Select British Poets*, and a new edition of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, with a life of Bunyan. Though he had

* Letter to Henry Taylor, Esq., November 13, 1826.

† Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., February 16, 1811.

‡ Letter to John May, Esq., March 1, 1833.

no cause to complain of any lack of civility on the part of the Grey and Melbourne administrations, it was not until the Tories again came into power that the sunshine of court favor began to fall on him once more. On the 1st of April, 1835, Sir Robert Peel wrote to him, offering him a baronetcy, and intimating a wish to serve him in any way that would be most agreeable to him. Southey, in his reply, entered into a detailed statement of his pecuniary affairs, and declined the offer, on the ground that it would be oppressive to his family to maintain the dignity of the station in the event of his sudden death. Sir Robert then determined to add £ 300 a year to the pension which had been given him by the Grenville ministry; and this intention was fully carried into effect before Lord Melbourne returned to office.

Southey was much pleased with this generous recognition of his claims on the part of his political friends; and there are frequent allusions to it in his letters. But a deep grief was then preying on his mind and casting a sober hue over all his joys. His wife, who had shared all his joys and sorrows through forty years, and to whom he was devotedly attached, had become hopelessly insane, and been carried to a lunatic asylum. Finding that her case was incurable, he afterwards brought her home; and during the remainder of her life he watched over her with unremitting care. From this "pitiable state of existence" she was released by death on the 16th of November, 1837. Southey had loved her with the utmost intensity of affection, and his grief at her loss was deep and sincere. "During more than two thirds of my life," he writes, "she had been the chief object of my thoughts, and I of hers. No man ever had a truer helpmate! no children a more careful mother. No family was ever more wisely ordered, no housekeeping ever conducted with greater prudence or greater comfort."* Time, however, soon assuaged his grief; and on the 5th of June, 1839, when sixty-five years old, he was married to Miss Caroline Bowles, a sister of the editor of Pope's works, and herself a poet of considerable merit, and the author of several volumes.

His last publications were a Naval History of England,

* Letter to G. C. Bedford, Esq., November 24, 1837.

in Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia, which he did not live to complete; The Doctor, one of the most curious and remarkable books ever published; a new edition of Cowper's Works, with a Life; and a collected edition of his own Poems. His powers, however, were now on their wane; and before long his mind was completely shattered. He had endured an amount of mental labor to which few men in any age have been equal; and at last both body and mind gave way. They could bear the strain no longer; and during the last years of his life he sank into a state of complete mental imbecility. But even now, according to his son, "His mind, while any spark of its reasoning powers remained, was busy with its old day-dreams,—the History of Portugal, the History of the Monastic Orders, the Doctor; all were soon to be taken in hand in earnest, all completed, and new works added to these."* He would sit and read, or walk mechanically round his library and take down the volumes which he had formerly loved, while his vacant look and hesitating step showed that reason had forsaken her throne. Death was, indeed, a blessing to him. He died on the 21st of March, 1843, and was buried in Crowthwaite churchyard, within sight of the once happy home where he had passed so many busy years. A monument was erected to his memory within the church, and other marks of respect were shown in different parts of the kingdom.

The peculiar traits of his character,—his amiability in all the relations of private life, his affection for his wife and children, his generosity towards young writers, and his bitterness towards his opponents,—the habits of his mind, the changes in his opinions, and the unsatisfactory basis on which those opinions rested, have been sufficiently exhibited in the course of these remarks. Of his position as a poet and prose-writer, and the general characteristics of his works, we may possibly have an opportunity to speak hereafter. But it will not be out of place to observe now, that, notwithstanding the great number of his publications, it is exceedingly doubtful whether he will maintain as high a place in the regards of future generations as he held in those of the last. Some of his works

* Vol. VI. p. 389.

will doubtless live and be admired always; but others have already been forgotten, and many more, we believe, will follow. Upon a careful estimate of what he has done, it is not believed that his name will hold a very high place among the illustrious writers whom his country has produced.

C. C. S.

ART. V. — JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

It is evident that the doctrine of "justification by faith" was, to the Apostle Paul, one of the distinguishing peculiarities of the Gospel as a practical system, if it was not the central principle of spiritual life. Whatever theory we adopt as to the extent of the great Apostle's inspiration, and the relation of his Epistles to the Saviour's words as authority in religious matters, the views of Paul must possess a great interest for every earnest Christian student, and every devout mind will feel more at ease, at least, to know that its own religious convictions are not opposed to those of the chief missionary of the Church. In regard to the doctrine of justification by faith, however, the difficulty of reaching the precise meaning of the Apostle is almost equal to the interest of the inquiry. In none of the Epistles is the subject developed systematically; it is only sketched, and rapidly presented; and all the passages that primarily relate to it would not, if arranged consecutively, equal the Epistle to Titus in extent.

We shall not find unanimity of opinion in relation to the doctrine among those Christian thinkers and commentators who consider that they are the patrons of it. As a general thing, however, orthodox believers consent in maintaining that Paul's theory is based on a sacrificial scheme of redemption, and implies that wonderful compromise between Divine justice and mercy by which, through the death of Christ, the sinner may receive pardon and be accounted just in the sight of God. According to this interpretation, the world, until the birth of Christ, was under a system of law, and only by perfect obedience to every demand of the law and every intimation of

conscience, could any soul expect any favor from the Almighty. God could not pardon the sins of men consistently with his equity, and since each sin deserved eternal penalties, the whole race was drifting swiftly to ruin. But the abasement, toil, sufferings, and death of Jesus lifted us out of the dominion of law;—some say, because he paid the penalties that were due; others say, because God's abhorrence of sin was sufficiently *expressed* in the degradation and agonies of the Saviour;—and thus a way was opened for a safe and consistent exercise of God's mercy, in the forgiveness of our transgressions. Instead of a keeping of the law, faith in Christ as a Saviour was substituted as the condition of acceptance, and all who acknowledge their depravity and moral impotence, and cling to Jesus as the Redeemer, will receive pardon, and experience "justification by faith."

Such is the logical skeleton of the prevalent theory, divested of those graces of rhetoric which have so often concealed the severity of its outlines, and that spirit of humility, reverence, and piety with which the lives of the best Christians have associated it.

It has always seemed to us a sufficient refutation of this version of Paul's doctrine, that it is opposed to the plainest principles of the Old Testament,—the literature of that very system of rigid law under which it is said the race was held before the coming of Christ. According to the sacrificial theory of justification by faith, the *peculiarity* of the Gospel lies in its offer of forgiveness, and its disclosure of terms by which pardon is possible on the part of God. But in the light of such a theory what shall we do with the Psalms and the prophetic books? Are they not distinguished for their rapturous descriptions of the joys of pardon, and their promises of forgiveness if men will repent? "The Lord," said David, "is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart, and saveth such as be of a contrite spirit." He even went so far as to say, "There is forgiveness with thee that thou mayest be feared." Isaiah, too, declared, among many other equally solemn and decisive passages, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." If we could bring together all the pas-

sages from the religious books of the Old Testament that bear upon this point, we should see that the Old Testament contains far more declarations of God's free mercy, and his willingness to pardon, than the New. Promises of God's favor are sprinkled upon its pages as thick and as brilliant as the stars that gem the night-heaven. Its inspired men plainly knew nothing of any conflict of Divine attributes, and they never coupled the exercise of mercy and forgiveness with any other condition than simple penitence.

Is it said, that these promises of pardon in the Old Testament were made to Jews who had an anticipation of the sacrificial death of Jesus, and were grounded on their fore-looking faith in that sacrifice? It is sufficient to give either of three replies to such a statement. First, that no such condition is ever mentioned, implied, or hinted by the Old Testament writers. Second, that pardon was granted to heathen nations, such as the Ninevites, who could have had no fore-looking to Christ, on the simple condition of repentance. Third, that the Jewish nation had so little anticipation of the atoning death of the Saviour, as a discharge of any debt to Divine justice, that the one thing which they could not comprehend about him when he came, and which shattered the hopes of his own disciples, was how their Messiah could die at all. "We have heard out of the law," they said, "that Christ abideth for ever; and how sayest thou the Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?" "The cross of Christ," that is, the ignoble death of Christ, "was to the Jews a stumbling-block," as well as "to the Greeks foolishness." The prevalent theory of justification by faith should be supported by a background of shadows in the Old Testament on the question of pardon, but upon that point the Old Testament is light.

It is not necessary for us to dwell long upon the point, that this common view of Paul's doctrine is inconsistent with the Saviour's teachings respecting Divine forgiveness, and his own relations to our spiritual welfare. We know that he said nothing about the impossibility of pardon except on the ground of an atoning sacrifice and our appropriation of it through faith. There are passages which speak of his taking away the sin of the world, and

which declare that whoso "believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life"; but no person would think of finding a sacrificial theory of forgiveness and justification in them. It is sufficient to allude to a few of the prominent instances in which the Saviour refers to the Divine mercy, in order to show how hostile such a theory is to the spirit of his instructions. Among the first declarations of his first discourse are the words, "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." We read, too, the language, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" We are taught, in the Lord's prayer, to ask forgiveness directly from the Father's mercy, not on condition of a substituted punishment, or any vicarious sufferings that open the way for the exercise of mercy. In the parable of the prodigal, do we not read, that as soon as the prodigal was penitent, and when he was "a great way off," the father's arms were opened, and he ran that he might welcome him? In the case of the Pharisee and publican, is it not said that the latter went down to his house "justified," after his sincere petition, "Lord be merciful to me a sinner"? And Jesus prayed for the forgiveness of his murderers, not on the ground of his own sacrifice, but because "they know not what they do." It is plainly impossible to reconcile the doctrinal substratum of the common views of justification by faith with the fundamental religious principles of the Psalms, the Prophets, and the four Gospels, and however we may wish to honor Paul, it is too dangerous, at least, to ascribe to him a theory which stands prominent by reason of such high relief from the rest of Scripture.

But great injustice is done to the doctrine of Paul by connecting it with such a theory of forgiveness, and the offer of any equivalent or legal tender to the Divine law for our transgressions. To his mind justification by faith was connected with a new and quickening revelation of God which Christianity brought. This new conception of God stood in total contrast to the Pharisaism in which he had been educated. We must study his doctrine, as it seems to us, with constant reference to the *Pharisaism* of his day, rather than to the *Judaism* of the Old Testament.

There is a world-wide difference between the ideas and spirit of the two systems, — a difference as great as that which separates a modern Portuguese Catholic priest from the spiritual state of a man like St. Augustine. That struggle, which is apparent enough in the Old Testament, of the prophetic against the priestly tendencies, of the living spirit against the technical forms of religion, had ceased. In Pharisaism the legal and ritual tendency culminated and triumphed. The feeling of joyful and vivifying *personal* relations with the Deity was lost. Traditionalism, as always happens, ended with stifling the life of the traditions themselves. The Pharisaic systems were as void of every thing that could impart and foster piety, as a mummy is empty of blood. The great Rabbis could tell the number of letters in each chapter of Moses; could give a fantastical interpretation of the plainest matters of fact in Jewish history; could inform their scholars as to the relative importance of the commandments, and teach them how to compound for remissness in one by extraordinary diligence with another; could give directions how to wash the hands before eating, and demonstrate the importance of pouring the water first upon the elbow, and letting it run off the ends of the fingers; could give minute directions about times of fasting, and the way of wearing sackcloth, and the manner of paying tithes, and the breadth and style of phylacteries, and the propriety of divorce, if a wife oversalted her husband's food; could show the necessity of stopping all work when the hour of prayer arrived, the reasons for reciting eighteen prayers a day, the number of cubits to be walked before a new one was commenced, and the proper forms of ejaculation if one suddenly came to a place where a miracle had been done, or idolatry rooted out, or if a dwarf, a negro, or a maimed man was encountered in the streets. The foundation of this theory of religion was the idea of God as the Almighty critic of human actions, and the claimant of perfect legal etiquette in every thought, and through every hour of the day. The type of character it produced may be symbolized by a stately and intricately constructed temple, in which is no hallowing presence, but where only dust and silence are about the dark and neglected shrine.

It was in the strictest sect of such a class of men that

Paul was educated. The idea of a covenant relation with God was familiar to him, by which certain favors, which it is needless here to specify, might be gained *by the Jews* on condition of strict obedience to the ritual and moral law. But the idea of any immediate communion with God, of direct, unpurchased favor from the Deity, of the intrinsic value and joyfulness of a religious state of heart, or any sense of the friendliness of God's providence, and an infinite desire in the Deity to bless and fill all the souls he had created, was what he had never dreamed. It is probable that the feeling of penitence was seldom experienced by even an earnest Pharisee, and the necessity of it did not make a vital element of their theology, so little account did they make, in their ceremonial stoicism, of spiritual life; so completely had they lost the sense of the Prophets and the Psalms; so thoroughly had they learned to materialize religion into a round of observances, undertaken for the sake of some promised benefit, and to consider God as the hard task-master and exact bargainer, who would not pay a jot, if the letter of the contract was not fulfilled.

Paul came out of these habits of thought into acquaintance with the Saviour's teachings, as one comes from a dimly lighted cave into the noonday. He learned there the parental character of God; that his spirit is ever near the soul, and his mercy infinite as his power; that he loves every spirit that exists,—Jew and Gentile; and that the soul may be conscious of that love, and live with a sense of filial fellowship with its Maker.

These truths opened a new world to him, and poured a whole tide of life into his breast. He had been an earnest man, and with his theory of religion his sins troubled him more than he could express. He felt that he was not fulfilling his own ideas of ceremonial and moral perfectness. How then could he believe that the strict, and omniscient, and all holy Jehovah regarded him as clean, and would treat him with favor? But now he found that where his chief difficulty lay, the great source of strength appeared. So far from being merely the strict scrutinizer and analyst of his deeds, God was his friend and father, and desired to have him cherish the filial temper of faith, reliance, and love, and would accept that state of heart as the great indication of loyalty, even

when the steps faltered and the will seemed weak. Thus his affections were reached, and religion became a power of life in him. Instead of looking ever at the stern standard of duty, and hearing the demands and the condemnation of the law, he could come into communion with God, as the very fountain of love and strength, and feel the invitations from heaven to a consecrated and faithful life. Sin seemed ever more heinous in his eyes than before, for it wore the same darkness as ever in the radiance of God's holiness; while the new light of God's Fatherhood was cast upon it, so that it became not only rebellion, but ingratitude. A new power, however, was imparted to his soul in the revelation of God's free goodness and paternity, which inspired his breast, and invigorated his will, gave him strange joys, turned his heart from any love of evil, and lifted him above the dominion of the law of sin and death.

It is in this connection that we shall appreciate the depth of Paul's meaning in his use of the words "grace," and "the Holy Spirit," and "the gift of the Spirit." As a Pharisee, such words could not have been received into his religious vocabulary. He had always considered himself one of a covenant people, who might expect certain favors for certain definite acts of service rendered. But, after his acquaintance with Christianity, he could speak of "access by faith to *this grace* in which we stand," and of "the *love of God* shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us." In this new manifestation of God to him he saw that his religious life would have an entirely different complexion, and be filial, not legal; liberty, not bondage; that he "should serve in the newness of the spirit, and not the oldness of the letter."

The second chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians discloses the same truth, that the peculiarity of his change from Pharisaism to Christianity consisted in the different view of God, and of relationship to God, which he obtained. From a stiff, isolated, and ritualistic, he became a healthy mystic, and could say with a rapture that he had never felt before, "Now we have received the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." This spirit was the joyous consciousness of God's favor which quickened every spiritual nerve, and enlightened the whole na-

ture, making life and duty wear a different hue. Before, God's highest quality, to him, had been holiness which made him unapproachable, and all thought of participation in his spirit blasphemous.

But the fullest expression of these new relations which acquaintance with Christianity had disclosed, and which inspired his heart, is found in the eighth chapter of Romans. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." And the new life that had been imparted to his inward nature is suggested in the passage, "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Thus the doctrine of justification by faith, which Paul, in becoming a Christian, adopted in exchange for his Pharisaic doctrine of justification by ritual and moral works, flowed from the totally different conception of the Deity that burst upon him in his conversion. It was the practical statement of the truth that God is not only the moral Governor, but the Father; it was the confession that, being children of God, and not his servants, we should *live* as his children, in love of him and confidence towards him, whatever be the course of his providence; since it is this spirit that he demands first of all, and this spirit alone that can purify character at its springs, and give us power and peace in all the trials and temptations, the darkness and sorrows, of life.

It remains now to speak of the relations which Christ sustains to this justification by faith. So far from its being true, that this faith, according to Paul, must be connected in any way with a placating sacrifice and cancelling death of Jesus, any such hypothesis, as it seems to us, stands in direct hostility to the Apostle's vital doctrine. We are not aware that any one has ever attempted to prove from the Pauline writings that there was a

conflict of Divine attributes which made it impossible for simple penitence to avail for the pardon of sin, and which required a sacrifice to open the possibility of Divine forgiveness. That theory is one of the corollaries of the Trinity, but it has never been directly proved from the Epistles.

Paul frequently speaks of the sufferings and death of Christ in connection with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and the new mode of justification by faith. But it is in another way that he connects the two facts. The soul experiences the new life and the justification by faith when it becomes conscious of God's parental relations to it, but it can get that consciousness only through faith in Christ, that is, in the whole mission of Jesus. God sent him as the exhibition of his own spirit of mercy, as the revealer of the new religious relation into which the soul might rise, and as the pledge that all the hopes born of that new relation would be fulfilled. In speaking of Christ's death, of course the Apostle's language would take the coloring of the Jewish sacrifices, and contain metaphors borrowed from the ritual; but whatever imagery he uses, his thought always is that Christ came to *reveal*, not to purchase, God's favor to men; to commend, not to bargain for, his love; to disclose the fulness of his love, not to remove any obstructions that had hampered its exercise.

Christ abased himself from his angelic state, according to the Apostle, took our form, lived, and suffered, that the depth of God's love for men, and his displeasure at sin, and his desire to have the race united to him in filial ties, might be most impressively manifested, and operate, in harmony with the great truths he taught, to quicken the affections of men, and root out the very principle of sin. "God commended his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" It was as a powerful declaration of God's desire to receive men to the nearest relationship and fullest communion, that he sent forth Jesus to teach, and toil, and suffer, and die. And the same truth is taught in the celebrated verses of the third chapter of Romans, "But now the righteousness of God without the law is *manifested*,"—

not bought, but manifested; and he speaks of the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth as a new Mercy-seat sprinkled with his own blood, to *declare* God's holiness and goodness in the forgiveness of sins. The forgiveness and favor of God are never spoken of as purchased by Jesus, but as revealed most vividly, in their highest form, through him; and since the soul can attain the knowledge of these relations and that inspiring disposition of God in no other way than by Christian discipleship, of course faith in the office and representative mission of Christ is the necessary condition of the possible spiritual blessings. Justification by faith is a matter directly between the soul and God, but the only way of attaining that peculiar knowledge of God, through which it could be experienced, was through entire and intense faith in Christ.

Nothing, then, as it seems to us, can be more completely opposed than the prevailing theories of Christ's mission, and Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, and his conception of the cross. They differ in form and spirit, root and branch, leaves and fruit. The one is founded on the idea of a conflict in the Divine nature, the other on the conception of God's free mercy; the one imagines that penitence of itself is unable to procure the pardon of sin, the other that God delights to receive the soul to his own fellowship, whenever it will break through its own wall of separation; the one is opposed to the plain doctrines of the Old Testament and the Gospels, the other is a clearer revelation of that mercy of which the prophets speak, and a new setting of the great truth taught by Jesus, — the paternity of God.

There are many other points of view from which the doctrine of justification by faith is presented in Paul's Epistles, such as his criticism of the history of Abraham, and his argument for the equal privileges of the Gentiles, — all of which illustrate and confirm the interpretation we have given; but it is not necessary to occupy more space with them here. We will only allude to the fact, that this theory of justification by faith is in harmony with the deepest Christian experience. All the spiritual life produced by the vicarious systems, we believe, is produced by the intense conception of Christ's free sacrifice and boundless love for the soul. This is, no doubt, most

deeply felt, and, as Christ is regarded in such systems as God, it is really the feeling of God's love and yearning towards our nature that fosters the highest and purest piety of the Trinitarian sects, — the same doctrine which Paul taught, and which belongs, or should belong, devoid of the Trinitarian absurdities, to the essence of every religious system.

There is no other spring of free spiritual life than the doctrine and the consciousness of justification by faith. No man can reach a perfect standard of duty, nor is there any standard nor any law so unchanging, that it will not rise into new loftiness as the soul spiritually ascends. If we stand outside the sphere of the spirit of God, and feel the eye of his holiness upon us, and have no other guide but conscience and the written law, we cannot have any satisfaction, any religious repose, any inward joy. The more intense the realization of God, the deeper the unrest. The Christian life is born of another experience, — the sense of God's paternal relations to us, the surrender of ourselves to him in a filial temper, the desire through prayerfulness and communion to live by his guidance, the disposition that manifests itself in penitence as in faithfulness, and the assurance that he will bless our aspirations, approve our struggles, and mercifully distinguish between failure of strength and disloyalty of will. In such an experience we are in harmony with Paul, and have an inward consciousness of justification by faith.

T. S. K.

ART. VI. — THE ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY OF
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

IN all ages of the world, and in all countries with which we are conversant, the firmament has been contemplated with awe. "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge; there is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard." The handiwork of Omnipotence is recognized by the savage and the sage, — the shepherds of Asia and the *savans* of Europe.

The vast accessions to our stock of astronomical knowledge which have distinguished the last half-century, and the deep and abiding interest which these acquirements have inspired on this side of the Atlantic, have necessarily given to institutions, strictly astronomical, a position and a value, to which a just view of their importance, in most of the great concerns of life, has at all times entitled them. In tracing the progress of American discoveries, we can scarcely persuade ourselves that only twenty-five years have elapsed since President John Quincy Adams, in his first annual message to Congress, urged upon that most unscientific body the establishment of a national observatory. At that period, as was stated by the President, while on the comparatively small territorial surface of Europe there were one hundred and thirty observatories, there was not one in our whole country; important as was the science to the growing commerce of the country, "year after year the earth rolled on in perpetual darkness to the unsearching eyes of one half of the globe." Still more difficult it is to believe, that this proposition, fraught as it was with the characteristic ardor of that illustrious patron of science, met only with the ridicule of the country. Length of days, however, enabled the veteran to sweep the heavens with his own eye, in his own State, by means vying with those of all Europe.

The establishment of an astronomical observatory connected with Harvard University was an early proposition of the late Dr. Bowditch, and a committee, consisting of himself and Professor Farrar, was appointed in the year 1816, to procure instruments in view of the immediate erection of a suitable building. The present Director of the Observatory, being about to visit England, was requested by the Corporation of the College to examine some observatories in that country, and to obtain plans and estimates adapted to the wants of the institution. This was done, and the result was reported to the College government; but it being impossible to secure the services of the first workmen in Europe, the whole matter was permitted to rest. In 1823, and again in 1825, President Adams, then Secretary of State, urged upon the Corporation the erection of a building, even though instruments could not be immediately procured, and, to promote this

end, he proposed at both these periods to subscribe one thousand dollars himself, provided the requisite sum could be raised ;* but the attempt proving ineffectual, no further action was had till the autumn of 1839. To astronomers, William C. Bond, Esq., of Dorchester, had been long favorably known as a skilful and diligent observer. With a few instruments, in a retired but beautiful position, "the world forgetting," he spent much of the night in observing and collecting celestial phenomena ; and though closely occupied during the day in an arduous calling in the city of Boston, no eclipse or occultation escaped his attention. The authorities at Washington had secured his services in a series of astronomical and magnetic observations, corresponding with those which were to be made by the Exploring Expedition. These, with only a trifling remuneration, aided by a much lamented son, he was prosecuting with unparalleled zeal, when the Corporation of the College, at the suggestion of President Quincy, proposed to him, with the consent of the United States government, to transfer all his instruments and apparatus to Cambridge. He yielded to this plan without prospect of pecuniary reward, and though a mere fraction of the observations made here and at Dorchester has been published, the volumes of the Transactions of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences bear testimony to an unexampled amount of labor. His hopes, however, rested upon the prospect, which he has since happily realized, of having at some day the management of such instruments as his gifts as an observer and skill in the adjustment of instruments justly entitled him to enjoy, and which would render him useful to science. A convenient house was procured near the Colleges, and smaller buildings were erected on the surrounding grounds for the transit and magnetic observations. The instruments conveyed from Dorchester, the property of the observer, consisted of an excellent four-foot transit, still in good condition, an altitude and azimuth instrument, one or two achromatics, a Gauss declination magnetometer, a magnetic dip circle, a sidereal clock, besides chronometers, and the usual meteorological instruments. In addition to these, the American

* President Quincy's *History of Harvard University*, Vol. II. p. 567.

Academy had purchased a set of Lloyd's magnetic apparatus, and placed it at the disposal of W. C. Bond. Thus equipped, the course of observations consisted of the transit of stars for time and the correction of instrumental errors, moon culminations with moon-culminating stars carried through the entire lunations, occultations of stars by the moon, monthly term-day observations of Lloyd's declination instrument, and horizontal and vertical force magnetometer continued through the whole twenty-four hours. The latter were made by the Gauss magnetometer, and sometimes in connection with Lloyd's. Meteorological observations were constantly kept up, and a part of the time were made hourly. In the magnetic observations the Messrs. Bond were occasionally assisted by Professors Peirce and Lovering; but the entire family of the Director were occasionally pressed into the service, though the chief aid was derived from the eldest son. This excellent youth devoted the brief period of his existence to the promotion of his father's wishes, and the amount of his labors and the accuracy of his results will be an enduring monument to his fidelity, as well as to his skill and application. Death deprived the father of the services of the son in November, 1842. His place has been admirably filled by his brother, George P. Bond, of whom we are soon to speak.

A part of the astronomical observations made at this establishment have been published monthly in the Proceedings of the American Academy. Copies of a greater number, however, are in the hands of Captain Wilkes of the Exploring Expedition, and of Sears C. Walker, Esq., of the Coast Survey, to be used in the determination of the longitude of various stations on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. Some of the magnetic observations are contained in the Memoirs of the Academy, and some have been published by Colonel Sabine; but much the larger portion remains unpublished.

Neither the Corporation of the College, nor the friends of astronomical science generally, were satisfied with the telescopes which had been placed at the disposal of Mr. Bond. Indeed, the College had hitherto furnished no instrument better than those removed from Dorchester, and even the contingent expenses of the establishment were paid from the personal resources of the Direc-

tor. This was no less a source of uneasiness to the College than to the Observer, and at length it was concluded to erect a building suitable for the accommodation of an Equatorial Refractor of the largest class, and forthwith to order the instrument. This design was largely promoted by the appearance of the great comet of 1843. The limits of this article will not admit of a detail of the steps that were taken to effect this desirable object. It is sufficient for our purpose, however, to say, what indeed is known to the friends of the Observatory, that the expense of the present institution was met by the united contributions of the College and of the American Academy, and by individuals, friends of science, citizens of Boston and its vicinity, desirous of securing the services of the present Director.

The building is beautifully situated on an eminence fifty feet above the level of the surrounding country, and distant three quarters of a mile in a northwest direction from the College buildings. The edifice, consisting hitherto of the centre building or tower surmounted by the dome which covers the Great Refractor, with one wing only, has presented an awkward appearance; but the other wing is now in progress, and when completed, the whole will present an appropriate and imposing aspect. On entering the lower apartment of the Observatory proper, the stranger is surprised that his progress is arrested by a prodigious circular mass of masonry. This is the pier for the support of the Grand Equatorial, the great step-stone of the work. The reader will perceive the necessity of this solid base, when he calls to mind the fact, that the slightest tremor, when magnified by the power of the instrument, becomes of sufficient moment to vitiate entirely the delicate determinations of the observer. To obviate this difficulty, an excavation was first made twenty-six feet below the natural summit of the hill, and at the bottom of this was placed a coating of cement intermixed with coarse gravel ten feet in thickness, which, when hardened, formed an entire mass of great firmness. On this bed the pier, composed of five hundred tons of large granite blocks well fitted to each other and laid in cement, rises thirty-three feet to the upper surface of the floor of the dome. On the capstone of this rests, on three bearers, a solid granite tripod

or pedestal, of eleven tons' weight, to the top of which is attached the Great Equatorial, which we hasten to describe, passing over most of the minor instruments of the Observatory. We have no hope, however, of doing any thing like justice to this noble instrument, which, in connection with all the apparatus of the Observatory then in use, is described scientifically by Mr. W. C. Bond in a memoir communicated to the Academy in November, 1848.

The Great Refractor was made by Merz & Mahler, the successors of the celebrated Fraunhofer, at Munich. It is the largest refracting telescope in the world; when finished, it was thought by the makers to be the best, and, if we can judge of its merits by its performance, we must concur in their opinion. Its only possible rival is that at Pulkova, which it somewhat exceeds in effective aperture, that at Cambridge having fourteen and ninety-five hundredths inches. Its focal length is twenty-two feet eight inches, and it is mounted equatorially on the German plan. It is furnished with eighteen eye-pieces. These consist of four annular micrometers, with powers as determined by the Director ranging from 103 to 373, five plain eye-pieces, with powers from 222 to 1,118, and nine spider-line micrometers, with powers from 141 to 2,004. The field-view of the latter is only a single minute of arc, somewhat less than a thirtieth of the moon's apparent diameter. The motion of the earth, which, with ordinary instruments, is constantly throwing the object out of the field, is here counteracted by clock-work, which communicates sidereal motion to the telescope. The defining excellence of this telescope is without example; with a power of two thousand, the *disks* of the satellites of Jupiter and that of Neptune have been well shown. With a power of eight hundred, stars have been separated, whose measured distance was only three tenths of a second. With this telescope the edge of Saturn's ring never disappears.

It reflects great credit upon the manufacturer, trifling as the fact may seem, that the packing of this instrument, with all its complicated and delicate machinery, was performed in such a manner as to secure its safety through the various modes of conveyance necessary in its journey from Munich. The granite pedestal, already alluded to, and to which the bed-plate of the equatorial mounting of the

telescope is attached, was prepared previously to the arrival of the telescope, and the mounting of the instrument, with all its equatorial and clock-work movements, attests the skill of the Director. Indeed, his mechanical gifts, and judgment in the adjustment of instruments of every description, have at all times given him an acknowledged advantage over most observers in this country and in Europe. His anxiety during the long period of its manufacture had impressed upon his mind's eye as perfect an image of every joint and screw and pinion as was subsequently impressed on his retina in the Observatory. The weight of the telescope, with its iron diaphragms and brass strengthening-rods, is upwards of three tons, and yet the friction is so successfully relieved by the judicious arrangement of wheels and counterpoises, that the finger of a child may change its direction. The improvements which the Director has made in the observing-chair must be gratifying to every one who has witnessed the awkward and painful twisting to which observers are usually subjected, especially in observations on zenith objects. It is ingeniously balanced by weights suspended by chains constructed in the manner of the *fusee* chain of a watch. It moves horizontally on rails of round inch-iron let into the floor of the dome, and the observer is enabled with perfect ease, at all times, without leaving his seat, or disturbing the chronometer which may lie beside him, to move the chair round on the railway, adjust his position in altitude, and change at pleasure the direction of the telescope.

Of the instruments of less magnitude, besides those brought from Dorchester, the most important are an excellent five-foot achromatic, mounted in a detached building, a comet-seeker by Merz, so fruitful in the hands of the younger Bond, and a transit-circle on the plan of that successfully used by Groombridge at Blackheath.

We come now to the results of the labor in the discoveries which have been made during the short period in which the instruments have been in working order. In discussing these, which we shall do briefly, it must be borne in mind, that the entire force employed in the Observatory, till within the last six months, has consisted of the Director, William C. Bond, assisted by his son, George P. Bond. The latter, a graduate of the Univer-

sity, had already distinguished himself as a mathematician, and though young has communicated several learned memoirs to the American Academy and other institutions. Their first labors were necessarily directed to the minute determination of the latitude and the longitude of the Observatory. In doing this, the wide difference between the skill and labor requisite in the minute determination of these elements, and that employed by the navigator or the geographer, must be understood and appreciated. An approximate result is all that is ever obtained at sea, except it be by accident. Observations of this kind are deemed of no importance to the Observatory. The position of the Observatory is the starting-point in all future time, and to obtain it with sufficient accuracy is a work of magnitude. For their latitude, besides various other methods, they obtained three hundred prime-vertical observations, and for their longitude, the transit of six hundred moon-culminating stars, two hundred occultations of stars by the moon, and all the visible eclipses that have occurred in clear weather. Besides these, the Director has been engaged, the last two years, for the service and at the expense of the Coast Survey, in accumulating results from chronometers of his own and those belonging to the Cunard line of steamers for relative longitude; and in order to obtain the best determination of local time at Liverpool, an arrangement was last year made with the Director of the new observatory of that city, who has obligingly taken charge of all the chronometers. The number of results hitherto made is one hundred and seventy-five by fifty chronometers in thirteen voyages. It may well be conceded that the data obtained by this variety of means, so multiplied, should entitle the Observatory to be considered the standard of longitude on this side of the Atlantic. Perhaps there is no spot on the whole face of the earth whose position is so accurately determined.

An immense labor has been involved in the examination of nebulae, as appears by the papers on this subject in the transactions of the American Academy. The well-known nebula of Andromeda and that of Orion were fields of special labor. Both of these nebulae have interested astronomers from early times; that in Andromeda long before the invention of the telescope. In Septem-

ber, 1847, very soon after the adjustment of the Great Refractor was completed, an examination of this interesting object was commenced, when it was found to have an immense number of stars scattered over its surface, and seeming to have no connection with it. Fifteen hundred were found to be within its limits; but the most remarkable features, now for the first time presented to the human eye, were two narrow, dark bands, in which no deviation from perfect straightness could be detected, and scarcely any deviation from parallelism. These bands stretched quite across the field of vision and through the entire nebula in the direction of the longer axis. In view of the distance of this nebula assigned to it by Sir W. Herschel, the younger Bond has estimated the length of these bands to be twenty times the distance of Sirius from the solar system. These phenomena have been since observed by Lord Rosse, and made the subject of an address to the British Association.

With regard to the great nebula of Orion, the public are already aware that the observers at Cambridge discovered very early after mounting the great telescope, that, in common with most nebulae, this also was composed of the blended light of an infinite number of stars clustering in obedience to some law, or in accidental juxtaposition. The Director has more recently subjected this beautiful nebula to rigorous scrutiny, and communicated his results in a learned memoir to the Academy, with a catalogue of the stars embraced in it and having no connection with its nebulosity. By means of this catalogue, and the maps and telescopic views which both observers have drawn, they have detected three new stars near the trapezium, and ascertained the curious fact, that one star in its neighbourhood of the sixteenth magnitude is variable in its light; at its minimum entirely disappearing. Probably this is the only variable telescopic star known, and extends this curious property to a very distant region. Other nebulae and clusters have engaged the attention of the observers at Cambridge, and among their diagrams they have completed a map of every star steadily visible by the Great Refractor in the cluster in Hercules, with a view of ascertaining, at a distant day, their relative motions and configuration.

At different periods through the years 1847 and 1848,

laborious observations were made upon the satellite of Neptune near the time of its greatest elongation, for the determination of its mean distance from the primary, in view of ascertaining the mass of Neptune as well as the orbit of the satellite. And although the results of Professor Peirce, as derived from these observations when compared with those of Professor Struve, have been the subject of criticism, their close agreement, when we consider the delicacy of these measures upon these exceedingly minute and immensely distant objects, may be placed, as it has been by Professor Peirce, among the wonders of modern astronomical observations.

On the 16th day of September, 1848, the younger Bond discovered a point of light, resembling a star of the seventeenth magnitude, in the plane of Saturn's ring, between two of the well-known satellites of that planet. He entered this upon his diagram of stars and satellites at the time in that region. On the 18th it was seen by both the observers, and by both recorded with expressions of doubt as to its true character. On the 19th their micro-metrical determinations indicated that it partook of the retrograde motion of Saturn, and no doubt remained that this object was a satellite of Saturn hitherto unknown to the world. It is very remarkable that this discovery should also have been made by Mr. Lassell of Liverpool only two days later, and we deem it quite as remarkable, and a matter of surprise, that the English astronomers claim the honor of this discovery. If the question be asked, Who saw it first? the answer from all parties must be, George P. Bond; and if it be asked, Who saw it next? the answer must be, William C. Bond; but the clew on which the British astronomers rest their claim is, that Lassell made a map of its position relative to the other satellites on the 18th. But the Bonds made "careful measurements" on the same day. Who ever thought of withholding from Sir William Herschel the credit of the discovery of Uranus, because he at first supposed it to be a comet, and because it was reserved for another observer to detect its true character many months afterwards? The editor of the London Athenæum, who never forgets the claims of England, maintains that there was no priority in either observer as to the first suspicion that the object was a satellite, and plausibly recommends

that the English say it was discovered by Bond and Lassell; the Americans, by Lassell and Bond. We do not assent to this. Bond saw the object and mapped it on the 16th; and both observers detected its true character on the 19th.

A multitude of observations have been made upon the changes in the belts of the planet Jupiter. These were taken during the years 1848 and 1849, when the planet was favorably seen in high northern declination. Changes in these and in the relative brightness of the satellites have been mapped out by the observers, with explanatory notes, exhibiting very interesting phenomena. In the prosecution of this inquiry, the elder Bond on one occasion saw an eclipse of the first satellite in the shadow of the third, both satellites being off the planet, and both shadows on, a circumstance necessarily of rare occurrence, and probably never before seen.

Drawings of the solar spots, which were observed on every clear day through the apparent annual revolution of the sun, have been made at the Observatory, and, when collected with the notes and explanations which accompany them, will furnish new data for the determination of the period of his rotation, and will contribute also to an explanation of those mysterious appearances.

Very valuable observations for the determination of the sun's parallax were made on the planet Mars in November and December, 1849, and January, 1850, during the opposition of the planet. Its position relative to the best situated fixed stars within the range of the micrometer of the Great Refractor was carefully measured every morning and evening. By allowing for the motion of the planet in the interval between the morning and evening measurement, they obtain the sum of its parallaxes, east and west, a quantity two or three times larger than the sun's parallax, which they propose to obtain from it. This method has been aforetime practised for the determination of the parallax of a comet while circumpolar; but never, we believe, for that of the sun. It is plain that, by taking advantage of the earth's rotation to carry them from one extremity to the other of a chord of about five thousand miles, they obtain the parallax of Mars as effectually as by the removal of the telescope to an equally distant point of the earth. For this class of ob-

servations, nothing can be more opportune than the electric clock, aided by the spring governor, a late invention of the Director, of which we have yet to speak. By means of this they can reckon on two or three thousand measurements for a night and morning's work of two hours each. Such a set of determinations, thus multiplied, will afford them as accurate a determination of the sun's parallax as can be obtained by a transit of Venus; and may be repeated as often as desired.

Eleven comets had been discovered by the Assistant Observer, George P. Bond, before receiving any intelligence of their having been seen elsewhere. Nine of these were strictly telescopic, — a greater number, it is believed, than has ever been discovered by any unassisted individual, except the celebrated Messier. With some of these, as with the satellite of Saturn, the European observations were nearly simultaneous; indeed, the comet of June 3, 1845, and that of April 11, 1849, were both discovered here and in Europe on the same day and at the same hour of local time, the priority being only equivalent to the difference of longitude. The first of these, which has been claimed by Professor Colla of Parma, and distinguished by his name, is another instance of European injustice. Both observers saw it on the morning of June 3d, civil reckoning. Colla obtained no observation of its place, merely stating it was in Perseus, and no European observations were made earlier than on the 7th; but the Bonds had good places on the 2d, 4th, and 6th, astronomical time, and it was subsequently proved that a Southern gentleman of this country saw it on the last day of the previous month. And yet this comet is called Colla's comet throughout Europe, and the Professor has claimed, and it is supposed obtained, the medal of the king of Denmark, although beyond question this was an American discovery. Stricter justice, however, is done in reference to the discovery of the comet of the 29th of August of last year. The priority of George P. Bond is acknowledged in Europe, and this comet is distinguished by his name.

Besides the elements of the comets discovered by himself, this young man has calculated those of twenty other comets, as well as the orbit of Neptune and that of the new satellite of Saturn. Those only who have per-

formed this operation can be sensible either of its labor or intricacy, and to those who are entirely familiar with the methods, the great liability to errors which are fatal to the results renders it at least a very perplexing problem.

We come now to the discovery of the new ring of Saturn, one of the greatest discoveries of the present age, and the highest proof of the excellence of the Great Refractor. During the last autumn, Saturn being favorably situated, the observers were perplexed with an appearance connected with this planet which was entirely new. This was a dark line bordering the inner edge of the ring projected with the shadow of the ring upon the body of the planet. At first they supposed this phenomenon had some connection with the shadow; but it could be traced on some occasions throughout the entire circumference of the ring, and on the inner anser of the old ring presented an edging of faint light. Suspecting its true character, the question remained unsettled till the beautiful night of November 15th. It was quite calm, the sky being just hazed over with thin cirrus. Saturn was on the meridian, and was probably never before so well seen. All doubt of the existence of a ring interior to any hitherto known was at once removed. The younger Bond has prepared a faithful drawing of its appearance on that occasion, it being exceedingly rare that an opportunity so favorable occurs. It has been intimated that the Cambridge observers have been anticipated in this discovery by several astronomers; but it is not so. The mistake originates in confounding a plurality of divisions of the old ring (which is all they profess to have seen) with the new ring. Encke's article in the *Astronomische Nachrichten*, No. 338, has been cited as anticipating the Cambridge discovery; but it contains not a word about a new ring inside of the old one. It simply intimates, what has been several times done, that there are glimpses of divisions in the old rings. He puts the inner diameter of the old ring at $26''.76$ at Saturn's mean distance, agreeing precisely with the Cambridge measurement, and also with that of Professor Struve. Now the diameter of the inside of the new ring is only $23''.3$. To suppose an error of this magnitude is absurd. The breadth of the new ring is somewhat less than that of

the outer of the two old rings. Its light is very much fainter, an interesting peculiarity; and hence it is that in crossing the bright planet it is distinctly visible as an exceedingly narrow dark line.

It may be asked why these discoveries were not before made. To satisfy this inquiry, it is sufficient to say, that at no time, since the mounting of the Great Equatorial, had the earth been so favorably situated, in reference to the plane of Saturn's ring, as when these discoveries were made.

We have spoken of the application of the "Spring Governor," an invention of the Director, and for which he has received the gold medal of the Massachusetts Mechanic Association. It was made in the Observatory under the eye of the Director, and owes much of its mechanical excellence to the skill of his son, Richard Bond. The importance of this instrument, in faithfully recording observations communicated by electro-magnetism, cannot be spoken of in exaggerated terms.

Magnetic wires, connected with the telegraph lines, and corresponding with the principal cities of the United States, had been brought into the transit building at the request of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey; but the confusion in the second marks made it nearly hopeless to expect any thing from the method of observing by electro-magnetism beyond a few experiments, as the difficulty of reading off the observations was more than the labor of obtaining them. This difficulty the Spring Governor has entirely overcome. It is a system of clock-work, regulating the rotary motion of a cylinder in such a manner that its revolutions shall be performed in a given time. The cylinder is of wood, with paper drawn smoothly over it. An hour's observations are recorded on a single sheet, and when removed from the cylinder, the minutes and seconds appear entered in regular horizontal and vertical columns, and may be read off by the eye without the slightest danger of confusion or inaccuracy. After the necessary preparation in the Director's office or elsewhere, the observer repairs to the dome, unattended if he please, adjusts the telescope to the position of a star night or day; in a moment, the object by the motion of the earth enters the field of view, and approaches the vertical wires in the focus of the telescope.

At the instant the star passes the wire, (his finger being previously placed upon the *break-circuit key*, attached to the observing chair,) he suddenly presses downward, and this simple movement being repeated at the transit of each wire, he returns to the office, and the minute, second, and part of a second of each event are there recorded as by magic. It is not important that the recording cylinder should be near, so long as the connection is perfect. Theoretically, it may be carried around the world, and practically to places quite remote.

In making this hasty sketch of the condition of this prosperous institution, we have passed over a multitude of observations and labors of less importance to science than those we have enumerated, yet not less necessary in the daily routine of duty; but we trust enough has been said to satisfy the generous contributors to this Observatory, that the best ends have been accomplished by their means, and we doubt not they will concur with us in the opinion, that, if we except the discovery of the planet Neptune,—which, as a mere discovery by the telescope, claims but little credit,—if we except this, the original discoveries made at this Observatory since its establishment are scarcely excelled by those of the whole world beside in the same period of time.

No one who is not familiar with the duties of an observatory can be sensible of the labor, the intense anxiety, the continual disappointments, watchings, and privations, to which the practical astronomer is subjected; and we know of no living man who has done so much drudgery for science, with so slight a reward, as William C. Bond. But a better day is dawning upon the father and the son. Edward Bromfield Phillips, a young man of fortune, a graduate of the University, a classmate and a friend of the younger Bond, died a few years since, leaving a bequest to the Observatory of one hundred thousand dollars, as a perpetual capital fund, the interest to be applied annually for the payment of the salary of the observers, or for instruments, or a library for the use of the Observatory, at the *discretion* of the Corporation of the College, who are made the trustees of the fund. It was an act of great discretion in this young man to place the funds in the control of persons who would be likely to be faithful in the execution of his wishes. With this

provision, and with that countenance and sympathy of the officers of the College which they have always enjoyed, the observers at Cambridge can scarcely fail to enlarge the bounds of science, and render themselves useful to the world.

W. M.

9

ART. VII. — THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW ON HUNGARY.*

IF any evidence were wanting beside that which is offered in the plain facts of the case, to prove how completely the cause of Hungary is identified with the cause of popular rights, this evidence would be found in the alarm which the prospect of the reëstablishment of that country excited in the despots and bureaucrats of Europe, the zeal and unanimity with which, from the first, their partisans assailed the patriotic movement there, and the paramount importance which they have attached to the Hungarian struggle over the other wars which agitated Europe in 1848 and 1849. They felt that the contest in Hungary was one which, in a peculiar manner, claimed the sympathy of free nations, and of those who desired or hoped for freedom, and that it threatened, in its double character of a war for freedom, and a war for constitutional rights and the integrity of a state, to enlist on its side men of all shades of liberal opinion, from the ultra radical to the moderate conservative. It was therefore found especially necessary to misrepresent the character of this war. This has been done systematically and most audaciously. It has been represented, on the one hand, as the result of a disorganizing and subversive movement, in order thus to excite the apprehensions of the adherents of the established order; while, on the other, to detach from the Hungarians the sympa-

* 1. *North American Review*, January, 1850. "*The War of Races in Hungary.*"

2. *North American Review*, April, 1850. "*The Politics of Europe.*"

3. *North American Review*, January, 1851. "*The Rebellion of the Sclavonic, Wallachian, and German Hungarians against the Magyars.*"

ties of the friends of freedom and progress, the contest which they so heroically maintained has been declaimed against as the attempt of an ambitious race, while securing their own independence, to usurp unjust dominion over their fellow-countrymen.

Neither of these charges can stand for a moment, when brought into comparison with the actual facts. The Hungarians desired no violent revolution. They wished, not the overthrow of their institutions, but their purification. They did not seek to expel their kings, but only to force them to the observance of their coronation oath. When blow after blow, beginning with the February revolution in France, was struck at the foundations of royal power in Europe, the Hungarians did not avail themselves of this season of imperial helplessness to revenge the wrongs and perfidies of centuries, and give the last impulse to the tottering throne. The revolution which they accomplished was a peaceful and bloodless one, conducted strictly within the bounds of law. They acquired by it only the possession of those rights which their constitution, and the terms of the compact in which the king was bound with his people, ought long before to have secured to them, and the guarantee of such an independence of the Austrian cabinet as was essential to the well-being of the country. Many causes combined to give to the Hungarian revolution of March, 1848, this character of moderation. The respect for law which has always distinguished the Hungarians, their generosity, and their high sense of national honor, had each a share in this result. The compact, whose fulfilment they had been so long vainly urging, it was not for them to violate, when fortune had placed them in the superior position, and had put it in their power to retaliate the faithlessness from which they had suffered. The Hungarians had never been known, in past times, to desert their king in his need; they had even disdained to extort from his distress concessions which they preferred to owe to his gratitude, when the return of the prosperity which their blood and wealth had aided to purchase should leave him leisure to reward — or to forget their sacrifices. Some of the most glorious recollections of their history were associated with this chivalrous loyalty to their thankless princes. Severe and repeated disappointments

had indeed taught the Hungarians to moderate this somewhat exaggerated sentiment; but the same generosity, chastened only by this bitter experience, the same high sense of honor, directed their conduct in 1848, which had governed it in 1741 and 1809. They resolved to demand the restoration of their constitution, and to enter at once, and in full, into the possession of those rights which they had before been gradually reclaiming, year by year; but they made no encroachment on the just prerogative of the prince. Nor, while they took measures to guard the liberties of their country from foreign dangers, were they unmindful of those which threatened its prosperity from the defects of its internal political organization. At the same time that the Hungarian nobles, who then represented the nation, acquired in the grant of a responsible Hungarian ministry the guarantee of the independence of their country, they demanded and obtained the right to divest themselves of their own privileges, and to bestow upon all the inhabitants of Hungary a share in the rights and duties of citizenship. A law was passed by the Hungarian diet, and received the sanction of the king in April, 1848, which bestowed the right of suffrage, limited only by a small property qualification, on all the inhabitants of the country.* In this fact alone is found a sufficient, an incontrovertible answer to the charge that the Hungarians of the Magyar race desired to oppress their fellow-countrymen. It is absurd, on the face of things, to talk of oppression exercised by a minority in a country where universal or nearly universal suffrage prevails. If there was any thing in the laws or institutions of Hungary which was displeasing to a majority of the inhabitants, they had a safe and easy remedy. They had no occasion to resort to arms to obtain the possession of any just right. They had but to bring the question before the legislative assembly of the nation, where superiority of numbers must have decided the victory. That the leaders of the insurgents in Hungary proper and Croatia constantly refused to submit their demands to such an arbitrament, though repeatedly called upon to do so by the Hungarian ministry, is the

* The deputies to the next diet, which was assembled in July of the same year, were chosen under this law.

best proof that they knew that they had not the nation with them, and that the majority of the Slavonians and Wallachs of Hungary felt, not as Slavonians and Wallachs, but as Hungarians.

The writer of the article called "The War of Races in Hungary," in the *North American Review* for January, 1850, completely ignores the important change which took place in the representative system in Hungary in 1848. There is not an intimation given in the article that he had so much as heard of the electoral law passed by the diet in March, and sanctioned by the king in April. So far from it, he ascribes the final decision of the Hungarians to effect a complete separation from Austria to the liberal terms of that portion of the constitution octroyed by Francis Joseph, which relates to the composition of his imaginary Austrian diet.

"The constitution of the lower house in the Imperial Diet is still more fatal to the lofty pretensions of the Magyars to govern all other races and nationalities. 'The lower house proceeds from general and direct elections. The franchise belongs to every Austrian citizen who is of age,' and who pays a moderate tax, which is not in any case to exceed twenty florins, and may be as small as five florins. This is equal suffrage, and it certainly comes as near *universal* suffrage as any reasonable liberal could desire, considering how little experience the subjects of Austria have had in managing representative institutions. Under such a law, the 4,200,000 Magyars lose all control even of Hungary proper, which has a population of 10,500,000; the reins pass at once from their hands into those of the despised Slavonians and Wallachians, who, taken together, number over six millions. The Magyar nobility, who number about 600,000, beheld themselves reduced from a condition in which they had the entire control of public affairs to a level with the eight millions of peasants. This proud aristocracy is absolutely crushed by the genuine republicanism of the constitution. *This was the grievance* which produced the Hungarian declaration of independence, a declaration put forth by a diet constituted almost exclusively of the Magyar nobility." — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. pp. 102, 103.

Is this justice to the reader who, in his confidence in the *North American Review*, applies himself to its pages in order to satisfy his mind in regard to the "nature and causes of the war in Hungary," and the "motives and aims of the belligerents," of which the Reviewer has

promised him an exposition? Could such a reader divine, from the above statement, that, nearly a year before the promulgation of the constitution of Ollmütz, the Hungarian nobles had, by their own act, placed themselves, with regard to political rights, on a level with the peasants? Could he divine that a law more liberal in its provisions than this which the Reviewer so praises was already in force in Hungary? that the deputies to this very diet which issued the manifesto of the 14th of April, were chosen under it? Yet this was the actual state of the case. If, then, this diet was "almost exclusively constituted of the Magyar nobility," it was because this nobility had so secured to itself the confidence of the people, that, after the extension of the right of suffrage, the new possessors of this right believed they could intrust their interests to no safer hands.

Neither of the writers referred to by the North American Reviewer, as his authorities, offers confirmation of his statements on this subject. Neither of them intimates that the Magyars endeavoured to secure undue political influence by a restriction of the rights of suffrage, founded on difference of race. Both De Langsdorff and Desprez (the Reviewer's authorities from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*) are advocates of what has been called the Slavonic party in Hungary, and appear to think the demands of this party to alienate from Hungary a large portion of its dominions very reasonable; but neither of them pretends that a deprivation of political rights made any part of the grounds of this intended separation. We have already seen* that De Langsdorff mentions the "*representation of the whole population, without distinction of rank or birth,*" † as among the first measures offered for the approval of the king in March, 1848. He afterwards states, that an electoral law was passed by the diet, by which "*the right of suffrage was conferred on all who possessed a capital of 300 florins.*" Desprez, in an article entitled "The End of the War in Hungary," ‡ in speaking of the conduct of the Hungarian patriots in March, 1848, says:—

"Borrowing from the legislators of the West the liberal princi-

* *Christian Examiner* for November, 1850, p. 475.

† *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Octobre, 1848.

‡ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1^{er} Septembre, 1849.

ples sprung from the French Revolution, they proclaimed equality of civil and political rights. Instead of attracting the Slavonians and Wallachians, these concessions repelled them. What they demanded was not an equality which incorporated and mingled them for ever with the Magyar race; it was the equality and autonomy of each nationality."

In another passage of the same article, Desprez explains more distinctly his views of the motives which actuated those of the Slavonians of Hungary who fought on the side of Austria.

"The Slavonians have fought to prevent the formation of a united Hungary, to dissolve the old Hungarian unity; in a word, to cut Hungary into four portions, according to the races. Is this clear? The Slavonians and the *Slavistes* have wished that a Magyaria, a Croatia, a Transylvania, and a Slovakia should be formed from the ruins of the Hungarian kingdom."

Here is something very different from a demand for an equality of political rights as Hungarian citizens.

Is it matter of surprise, is it matter of censure, that the Hungarian patriots could not at once bring themselves to consent that this idolized fatherland, which they hoped to raise into a free and powerful country, should be cut up into a number of petty states, which must, separately, be defenceless against the usurpations of Austria? And this, too, when the demand was made, not by the general voice of the people in whose name it was offered, but by ambitious demagogues in league with the Austrian government? Yet for this refusal the Hungarians have been assailed with equal violence by the reactionary and the ultra-radical writers in Europe. By the first, advisedly, and from sinister motives. By the last, ignorantly and sincerely. By many of these writers, the mere fact that an insurrection has taken place in a country is accepted as sufficient proof that there was just cause for it. Thus, when they hear of the Servian insurrection, by which a portion of Hungary was ravaged in the summer of 1848, they cry out against the pride and obstinacy of the Magyars, who, as they assume, refused to do justice to the claims of the Servians. Let us examine, then, the claims of the Servians, or, we should rather say, the claims made in their name, by the unprincipled and reckless men who worked upon the prejudices of an ignorant people.

The Servians or Rascians of Southern Hungary are not, as is commonly taken for granted by the accusers of the Magyars, the descendants of the original inhabitants of that country, striving to regain an independence of which their ancestors had been deprived by the Magyar conquerors. They are the descendants of emigrants from the Turkish provinces, who have taken refuge in Hungary in large bodies, at different periods.* A large migration of this sort took place in 1481, in the reign of King Matthias; another in 1690, when a body of this people, consisting of between thirty and forty thousand families, passed into Hungary, under their patriarch Csernowics, and were permitted to settle on some of the lands recently recovered from the Turks. The Rascians or Servians are chiefly of the Greek religion, and among this portion of them Russian emissaries have been at work for the last twenty years, inciting them to hatred of the Magyars.† A large body, chiefly composed of the lowest class of this people, assembled at the summons of a priest of the Greek Church, named Raiachich, in the month of May, at Carlowitz, in what they called a Servian national assembly. To this meeting thronged great numbers from the neighbouring principality of Serbia, from Bosnia, and the other Turkish Slavonian provinces. Acting under the direction of Raiachich, this heterogeneous multitude declared the independence of the Servian nation, elected a Woiwode, and resolved that a large portion of Southern Hungary, including the whole of the Banat, the counties of Bács-Bodrog, Baranya, and Szerem, and a portion of the military frontier, should be formed into an independent Servian Woiwodina. The Servians did not compose the whole, or even the larger part, of the population of the region of which they proposed to possess themselves. Some statistics of the counties which they proposed to separate from Hungary will place the case in a clearer light than any other mode of argument.

* See Engel, *Geschichten des Ungarischen Reichs*, III. 381; V. 144, 149, 150. Schwartner, *Statistik des Königreichs Ungern*, II. 110. Schütte, *Ungarn und der Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, I. 205. Csaplowics, *Gemälde von Ungern*, I. 197.

† The reader will find much interesting information in regard to the intrigues of Russia in Hungary and Transylvania, in Mr. Paget's work on those countries. See *Hungary and Transylvania*, Vol. I. pp. 33-35, 127, 128, 478 (English edition of 1850).

Of the three counties of the Banat, — Torontál, Temes, and Krassó, — Torontál has a population of 349,836. Of these, 136,932 are of Slavonian race, of whom 124,447 are Servians. In Temes, of a population of 320,475, there are of Slavonian race 23,678, of whom only 14,260 are Servians. In the county of Krassó, out of 219,191 inhabitants, only 10,040 are of Slavonian race; of the Servian tribe there are none. In the county of Szerem, the Servians form the majority of the population. Of 106,924 inhabitants, 101,528 are Servians. The whole population of the county of Bács-Bodrog is 493,786. Of these, 200,470 are of Slavonian race, of whom 189,991 are Servians. The population of the county of Baranya is 251,552. There are in this county only 41,000 Servians; the rest of the inhabitants being chiefly Magyars and Germans, — 132,480 Magyars and 76,834 Germans.*

The insurgent Servians, whose principal force consisted in the trained troops of the military frontier, reinforced by large bodies of Slavonians from Bosnia and Servia, supplied with arms and ammunition from the Austrian arsenals, and led, even, in many instances, by Austrian officers, fell upon the defenceless inhabitants of the region of which they wished to possess themselves, burning and plundering, with every refinement of cruelty. This is the Servian insurrection, on account of which sympathy has been demanded for the oppressed Servians.

This cry of "Magyar oppression" has been so bruited through Europe, that it has come to pass current as an accepted fact by that large class of persons who believe a thing because they have heard it often. But when the grounds of the charges against the Magyars, which have gone the rounds of German and French newspapers and reviews, are examined, there will be found nothing, which — except in the view of an advocate of an exaggerated, and, in the present state of Europe, impossible application of the principle of "equality of rights for all nationalities" — could convict the Magyars of injustice. It will not appear that they desired to exercise any other ascendancy in Hungary than such as is possessed by some one race in every country where the population is

* Fényes, *Magyarország Leirése*, Pesten, 1847.

not perfectly homogeneous;—such, for example, as is exercised by the Anglo-Saxon race in the United States. The German of Pennsylvania, the Frenchman of Louisiana, is not said to be deprived of his political rights because neither the German nor the French language is placed on an equality with the English, as the official language of the country.

The North American Reviewer has entirely misapprehended the questions at issue in Hungary.

“We see not,” he says, “what right the Magyars have to appropriate exclusively to themselves the name of *Hungarians*, though they are less than five millions in number, and first came into the country as intruders and conquerors in the tenth century, while they refuse to give this common appellation to the Sclavonians and Wallachians, numbering over seven millions, who were the aboriginal and rightful possessors of the soil.”—*N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 502.

The very object which the Hungarian patriots had in view was to make a Hungarian citizen of every inhabitant of the country. It was to prevent the accomplishment of this object that the Austrian government employed its agents to sow dissension in the various parts of the country. It was to further this object,—the making Hungary a firm, united state, capable of defying both the power and the arts of Austria,—that such efforts were made to promote the cultivation and diffusion of the Hungarian language, and to effect its establishment as the official language of the country.

There is no subject in regard to which the Hungarians have suffered greater misrepresentation than this question of language. The North American Reviewer has accepted and transferred to his own pages the most injurious of the charges which have been brought against them. Yet, in the work of De Gerando, which he took as the theme of his article, he might have found accurate details upon this subject, and the confutation of these very charges. De Gerando speaks often and feelingly of the cruel calumnies which were put forth on this subject by a portion of the German press.*

* Pulezky, a Hungarian noble of Slavonic descent, wrote a very able pamphlet on this subject, entitled *Die Sprachfrage in Ungarn*, in which he showed the injustice of the charges which were brought against the Magyars.

“The German press,” he says, “took upon itself the office of supplying with information those in foreign countries, who took an interest in this question. It did so in the same spirit of impartiality which had characterized the accounts of the debates in the diet. ‘The oppression of the Slavonians’ served these writers as a new theme for their attacks on the liberal party. They published a number of incredible stories, and converted into an odious tyranny what was only the legitimate exercise of a political supremacy. They had declared that the emperor, in his liberal and paternal attempts in favor of the people, had been checked by the feudal pretensions of the aristocracy. They now affirmed further, that, the diet wishing to impose the Hungarian language by violence upon all the inhabitants, the sovereign, from a sense of justice, had found himself constrained to take the part of the oppressed. The Hungarians have complained of these calumnies; but they have, perhaps, been of service, by forcing them to watch over themselves, and to banish from their thoughts every thing which could resemble oppression. When, in fact, their opponents were called upon to make an exposition of their grievances, they could only cite, in a large book which they wrote on the occasion, a few isolated facts which had already been condemned by a general censure. For never has the diet, never has the Hungarian nation, manifested exaggerated pretensions.”— *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 353, 354.

The vindication of their nationality was not the only object which the Hungarians had in view in establishing the national language as the language of public affairs, and in encouraging its cultivation. There is another very important view of the subject. We will present this view in the words of De Gerando.

“In restoring priority to their language, the Hungarians were not merely fortifying the independence of Hungary. It was not merely a question of recovering a lost position, but also of effecting a democratic revolution. The Latin language might indeed suffice for the country as long as the nobility alone were counted in the state. But it must necessarily give place to a popular idiom, when political rights were no longer to be confined to a small number.”— *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 333, 334.

Which of the languages spoken in Hungary had a claim, then, to occupy this place? The language of the people who had given their name to the country, who had framed its institutions, who were, moreover, the most numerous race speaking one language,*—the

* There are not less than seventeen different languages and dialects spoken in Hungary.

language which, for the very reason that it was that of the principal race, and regarded as the national tongue, is more diffused than any other? * Or should one of the Slavonic dialects be selected, each confined to its own locality and spoken by a comparatively small number of people? If all existing claims of precedence were set aside, how should the question of priority of language be decided? The question lay, in fact, not between the Magyar language and any dialect of the Slavonic, not between the Magyar and the Wallachian, but between the Magyar and the German, the national language and the language of the foreign prince. The German language was, therefore, in Hungary, the symbol of subjection; the Magyar, that of independence.

It has been asserted that the Slavonians of Hungary, on this question, held the same position in regard to the Magyars, that these held to the Austrian government. This assertion was made by Count Leo de Thun, a Bohemian writer, who was one of the first that attempted to excite the Slavonians of Hungary to organize an opposition to the establishment of the Hungarian as the official language of the country. De Gerando thus comments on this assertion:—

“‘The Slavonians,’ says Count de Thun, ‘in resisting the Hungarians, would be in the same position as the Hungarians resisting Austria.’ These two situations ought not to be confounded, for Hungary only resists when it has to repel oppression. Besides, the Hungarian law which distinguishes Hungary from Austria makes no distinction between Slavonian and Hungarian, and it is to this equality that the Slavonian has owed his political rights. The author does not perceive that he is aiding the Austrian influence, which he dreads, he says, for Bohemia, his own country, as well as for Hungary. Resistance, in this case, is equivalent to separation. Hungary ought to remain separate from Austria, under pain of seeing itself confounded with the other states of

* De Gerando states that the Hungarian language is more widely diffused in Hungary than the French language was in France fifty years ago. “In 1793,” he says, “French was only spoken in fifteen departments of the interior, and a fourth part of the population were at that time wholly ignorant of the national language.” “The Hungarian language,” he says, “though belonging to only about five millions of the inhabitants of Hungary, is familiar to a much greater number.” “At the great fairs of Hungary,” he afterwards adds, “I have heard the Slavonians of different dialects converse in Hungarian, in order to understand one another.” — *De l'Esprit Public*, pp. 323, 324.

the empire, and of losing its glorious initiative, its life even, — nothing less. The example of Galicia, where the imperial administration has waited eighty years before undertaking the most elementary work of civilization, even suffering the Russian government itself to go in advance of it, tells, plainly enough, what would become of Hungary, if it were ever abandoned to Austrian activity. It is because resistance has the meaning of separation that the Slavonic resistance, if it were organized, would not only be anti-Hungarian, but anti-Slavonic. In order that Hungary should preserve and develop its free institutions, which all its inhabitants enjoy, or will soon enjoy, without distinction of language, it is necessary that it should weigh in the Austrian monarchy with the weight of thirteen millions of men. It is necessary that the sovereign should have to do, not with seventeen different populations, but with thirteen millions of Hungarians. The contest between Austrian and Hungarian influence in Hungary, is that of absolutism and liberty. Whenever the emperor of Austria shall make a census of the population of the country, he will not find Slavonians there, except to find Austrians. To understand the importance of this fact, it is necessary to know that the German population, although less numerous, has much more weight than the Slavonic element, because it is more cultivated. It is the error of Slavomanic writers, foreign to Hungary, to believe that, if the Hungarians had lost their supremacy in this country, it would have been taken from them by the Slavonians. On the contrary, it would have been by the Germans. This is so true, that there where the Hungarian spirit has found antagonists, in Croatia, Austria already acts as absolute mistress.”* — pp. 347, 348.

Let us now examine the statements made by the North American Reviewer, in regard to this question of language. The first statement made by him on this subject is the following: —

“In a country where there was so great a confusion of tongues, it was absolutely necessary that some one language should be chosen for a universal medium in matters of government and legislation. The Latin has long been adopted for this purpose, its use having come down from the Middle Ages, when it was the general medium of learning throughout Europe, and its preservation in Hungary so long after it was abandoned elsewhere being due to the rivalry of different nationalities, two or three of which have been offended by the selection of any living

* De Gerando's work was completed at Presburg, in November, 1847, and was published in 1848, before the war.

language. The Latin was neutral ground, on which the German, the Magyar, the Sclavonian, and the Wallachian could meet without cause of offence." — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 111.

Where, we would ask, was the necessity for such a compromise between the different nationalities, in regard to the language used in matters of government and legislation, if the Magyars, according to the Reviewer's repeated assertion, "held the whole political power of the country in their hands" (p. 83), — if "the affairs of the counties are regulated exclusively by *Magyar* nobles" (p. 88), — if "they *alone* compose the county assemblies, which send delegates to the general diet, which has the supreme legislative power of the kingdom" (p. 94)? Surely it was an extraordinary act of complaisance, on the part of these haughty oppressors, to forbear the use of their own language out of consideration for their subjects, who, after all, could be but little sensible of the favor, they having, as it would seem, no share in "matters of government and legislation," and, from the account given by the Reviewer of their condition, being very little likely to be much better acquainted with the Latin than with the Magyar. And, again, how came these "subject races," as the Reviewer is pleased to style them, — these "*patient and laborious Wallachians and Sclavonians, who have tilled the ground for them [the Magyars] for centuries, hardly conscious how firmly the yoke of servitude rested on their necks*" (p. 87), — to be thus suddenly elevated to a condition of "rivalry" with their lords? On page 85, we are told that "submission and inferiority have been enforced upon them through so many generations, that they have become the *badges of their tribe, and it is only within a few years that the idea of resistance, or the possibility of asserting an equality of rights, has even occurred to them.*" On the same page we are told that

"The subject nations, both Wallachian and Sclavonic, are a rude, uneducated people, who have never been able to acquire the languages of their masters, which are fundamentally different from their own; and this circumstance alone has raised an insuperable bar to intercourse between them."

Rather an inconvenient state of things certainly, people living together in the relation of masters and servants for nearly a thousand years, and all the while "an insu-

perable bar to intercourse between them"! Does the Reviewer intend to say that this bar was happily removed by the introduction of the Latin, and that this language has furnished a "neutral ground," on which this "rude and uneducated people" could meet their "lords"?

The Reviewer then speaks of the attempts made by Joseph the Second to introduce the German as the official language of Hungary, and the successful resistance offered to his encroachments. He then proceeds:—

"The Magyars had thus vindicated the respect due to their own vernacular tongue, but they were not willing to respect the language and the national feeling of others. By constantly pressing the Austrian government on this point ever since 1800, they had at last succeeded in causing the Latin to be supplanted by the Magyar language in the deliberations of the Diet, and in the acts of the government; this change was not consummated till 1844. The few Sclavonians in the legislature were still allowed, as of necessity, to address the assembly in Latin, and the government officials sometimes spoke German, though they risked their popularity by so doing."— p. 112.

This statement that "the few Sclavonians in the legislature"* were still allowed to use the Latin language,

* The diet of Croatia and Slavonia sent three deputies to the Hungarian diet, one of whom sat in the upper, and two in the lower house. The Ban of Croatia and the Bishop of Zagráb (in Croatia) had also seats in the upper house, or Chamber of Magnates. The free district of Turopolya (in Croatia), whose inhabitants were ennobled in 1225, likewise sent a deputy to the Hungarian diet. The number of nobles in Croatia is 32,000. Slavonia had not only a voice in the choice of the deputies elected by the provincial diet, but the three counties of Slavonia—Veröcze, Pozsega, and Szerem—also sent each two deputies to the Hungarian diet, these counties being on a perfect equality in that respect with the other Hungarian counties. "Thus," says Casplovics (a Slavonian Hungarian), in his *Slavonien und Croatien*, "the Slavonian counties are doubly represented in the Hungarian diet; namely, on their own account, and also by the Croat-Slavonic deputies." The number of nobles in these counties is very small, in consequence of this part of the country having been long under the dominion of the Turks. After its recovery, it remained for some time under the government of the Vienna Council of War, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the Hungarian diet. These three counties were reestablished as Hungarian counties in the middle of the last century. Veröcze has a population of 135,624; nobles, 1,014. Szerem has a population of 106,924; nobles, 816. Pozsega has 73,129 inhabitants; nobles, 638. The nobles in these counties are so few in number, that offices were often bestowed upon non-nobles. (See Casplovics.) These counties sent the same number of representatives to the Hungarian diet with the largest Hungarian counties; with Bihár, for example, which has a population of more than 490,000, and more than 30,000 nobles. In the diet of 1843–44, the diet of which the Reviewer here speaks, were deputies of Slavonic race, not only from Croa-

after the law had made the Magyar the language of that assembly, seems not altogether in keeping with the rest of the conduct ascribed to the Magyars. This indulgence, and, indeed, the very appearance of these Slavonians in the diet, argue, it would seem, a liberality hardly to have been expected from this "haughty and imperious race."

The next statement of the Reviewer is, however, well calculated to remove any such favorable impression.

"Having carried this point against the Imperialists, the Magyars attempted to impose their language upon the subject races, and to oblige them to *use it upon all occasions*.(!) The schoolmasters and the clergy in every province and every village, though it might be inhabited exclusively by Sclavonians and Wallachians, were ordered to teach and to preach only in the Magyar tongue. This law created great irritation everywhere, but especially in Croatia." — p. 112.

If the Reviewer had stated accurately what laws were passed by the Hungarian diet to promote the diffusion of the national language, and had candidly considered their justice and expediency, he would have given his readers an opportunity of judging for themselves of the merits of this question. Accepting as literal facts all the statements which he lays before them on this subject, they could make but one decision. It was the object of the Hungarian legislature to promote by every just and reasonable means the diffusion of the national language throughout the country, that the people of Hungary might thus become, in time, a united and powerful nation. But it never attempted to proscribe the languages of the non-Magyar inhabitants of Hungary, or to impose the Magyar upon them by violence.* From the time that the Magyar was made, in the place of the Latin, the official language of the country, it became the duty of the legislature to provide that all the inhabit-

tia and Slavonia, but from many counties of Hungary proper, and this not only from counties chiefly peopled by Slavonians, but in some cases even from those in which the Magyar population predominates. Those counties of Hungary proper in which a Slavonic population predominates were on precisely the same footing in regard to representation as the other Hungarian counties.

* De Gerando, *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 335, 345, 353, 354.

ants of the country should be furnished with the means of acquiring a knowledge of this language. It certainly was not inflicting an injury on the Wallach or the Slavonian of Hungary, to afford him an opportunity of learning the language, a knowledge of which enabled him to understand the proceedings of the legislature, and opened to him the career of public life. That the object which the national and liberal party in Hungary had in view was of great importance to the prosperity and freedom of the country, cannot be questioned. Among its most ardent promoters were found men of Slavonian race.

The statement, that the clergy were ordered to preach *only in the Magyar language*, even to Slavonians and Wallachs, has no other foundation than the passage of a law by the Hungarian diet, in 1840, ordaining that a knowledge of the Magyar should, for the future, be required in candidates for ordination to the clerical office. This was one of the means taken for the promotion and general diffusion of the national language. It was not, certainly, expected that any clergyman should preach in this language to a parish that did not understand it. A knowledge of the principal languages of the country was very important to a clergyman. It not unfrequently happened that the population of the same parish was composed of different races, and, in such cases, it was not unusual for the same clergyman to perform the religious services in the different languages alternately. The law requiring a knowledge of the Magyar language in candidates for ordination was enacted for Hungary proper only, and did not extend to Croatia.

De Gerando, in the work which the Reviewer claims as one of the chief sources of his information, when speaking of the calumnies against the Hungarians circulated by the German press, gives the following story as an example:—

“One of the least ridiculous of the tales put forth by the German press is the history of the pastor of Kementze. . . . The Augsburg Gazette (*Allgemeine Zeitung*), on the 17th of August, 1843, related the following story:—A Hungarian minister, M. Söresz, who was completely ignorant of the Slavonic language,

was placed over the Slavonian Protestant parish of Kementze, with orders to Magyarize the inhabitants. He made constant efforts to obtain the prescribed end, but, after twelve years of fruitless attempts, touched with the complaints of his parish, he began to make use of the Slavonian, which he had learned at Kementze. The superintendent of the district, having asked an account of his mission, M. Söresz replied that he had labored in vain to Magyarize the Slavonians, and had renounced the project, which, indeed, he regarded as an impiety. This reply caused the removal of M. Söresz. But the parish having threatened the superintendent that they would embrace Catholicism, if deprived of their minister, he was restored, and continues to live and to speak as a Slavonian.*

"This account, very circumstantial, as the reader may observe, bore the signature of the person who wrote it. No detail was wanting. The names of persons and places were cited, in such a manner that it seemed impossible to doubt the truth of the fact. Yet in all this recital there is not one word of truth. M. Söresz, informed of the publication of this fable, contradicted, in a very energetic declaration, made in his own name and that of his parish, what he called a *panslavistic calumny*. He discovered nine falsehoods in the relation which has just been read. To speak only of the principal ones, he declared that he was himself a Slavonian, although his name indicated a remote Magyar origin; that he had been sent to Kementze, not to Magyarize the inhabitants, but for the very reason that he was himself a Slavonian; that he had never spoken Magyar to his auditors, for this reason, among others, that this language was less familiar to him than his own; that he had never been reprimanded or removed by the superintendent, and that his parish had never manifested the intention of abjuring Protestantism. The story of Kementze was, I believe, translated into all languages, and followed by others of the same kind, which we spare our readers." † — *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 354 — 357.

The statement, that the Magyars endeavoured to impose their language on the other races, and "to oblige them

* "These details are the more extraordinary, inasmuch as there are at the very gates of Pest, in the heart of Hungary, villages which are inhabited conjointly by Magyars, Slavonians, and Germans, and in which the religious services are performed alternately in the three languages." — *Note by De Gerando*.

† "We must do the *Allgemeine Zeitung* the justice to say, that, on this occasion, it reprinted the refutation (Jan. 30th, 1844). This is a fact sufficiently rare to deserve notice. It may be remarked, in passing, that the day on which the *Allgemeine Zeitung* should write with independence would be the last on which it would be received in Austria, where it numbers two thirds of its subscribers." — *Note by De Gerando*.

to use it on all occasions," has no foundation in any act of the Hungarian diet. The Reviewer appears, however, to be quite serious in this assertion, for we find him afterwards enumerating among the claims of the Croats and other Slavonians, which the Magyars, according to him, could not bring themselves to grant, even after the war with Austria had begun, the permission to "*speak their own language*"!*

The unhappy dissensions which had existed in Croatia for many years previous to the events of 1848, had their origin chiefly in causes over which the Hungarians had no control. These causes were found in the agitation carried on by the emissaries of Russia, in the efforts of the propagandists of panslavism, and, above all, in the perfidious policy of the Austrian government, which fostered every latent germ of strife.

The Austrian government had, indeed, for a course of years, both by open, illegal proceedings, and underhand machinations, interfered with the rights and disturbed the peace of Croatia. The Hungarians had not encroached upon the liberties of their Croatian countrymen; they only desired that the union should be maintained, by which the welfare of both people was promoted. The feeling which the national party in Hungary entertained for their Croatian countrymen may be judged of by the following letter, addressed by the Committee of Order in the city of Pest to the Croats, in March, 1848, shortly after the consent of the king had been obtained to the demands of the Hungarian people.

"Croats! brothers! After suffering from an oppression of three centuries' duration, we stand, at last, on the threshold of independence and liberty. The victory we have won has been won for you as much as for ourselves. The watchword under which we have contended, and under which, if it be needful, we will still contend, is not nationality, but the holy name of independence, of freedom, comprising all nationalities and all interests. The cause is common, yours as well as ours. The enemy is common to us both; — the Austrian despotic bureaucracy. Against this we must unite, Magyar, Croat, Serb, German, Wallach, and every race that inhabits this land. Only thus can we win, only thus can we maintain, the independence, the liberties, of the country. Beloved countrymen! It is in the holy name of

* *North American Review*, Jan., 1850, p. 129.

the friendship which, through good and evil fortune, has bound us for eight hundred years, that we address you. The brother will hear the word of the brother. Croatians, by all you hold sacred, we conjure you, let there be no variance between us. Let us forget diversity of language, we who are one in the interests of common liberty. Let us not listen to those who incite us against each other, for they wish to use our disunion for our common weakening and oppression. Brothers, let us be united."*

The Austrian government, forced to yield to the demands of the Hungarians, had recourse to its usual system of policy. At the same time that the demand for an independent Hungarian ministry was granted, Jellachich was appointed to the office of Ban of Croatia, at the request of that portion of the inhabitants who desired the separation of that country from Hungary, and the erection of an independent Slavonic state. The views of this party, indeed, went very far beyond those which were expressed in the demand they made of the Austrian government. The Slavonic party in Austria and Hungary looked forward not so much to independence as to domination. They cherished schemes of completely revolutionizing the Austrian empire, and converting it from a German into a Slavonic empire. Having this view, they were very willing to see Hungary reduced to the condition of an integral part of this empire, in which they promised themselves their numbers would give them the predominance. Whether Jellachich was originally the deceiver or the deceived, whether he intended to make use of the Austrian government, as the Austrian government intended to make use of him, or whether he was, even at the time of his appointment, ready to sacrifice both the schemes of his party and the liberties of his country to his own personal ambition, it is not easy to determine. The Illyrian party in Croatia saw his conduct, at the time, in the former light, and gave in to what they supposed to be his plans, little dreaming that the result was to be, not only the demolition of their air-built castles, but the loss of that liberty which Croatia had before enjoyed, under the protection of the Hungarian constitution.

From this time, the leaders of the disunion party in

* Szilágyi, *A Magyar Forradalom Története*, Pest, 1850.

Croatia assumed the tone of loyal subjects of the emperor and king. They denounced the Hungarians as rebels, and declared their own watchword to be, "the integrity of the empire." From the time of the entrance of Jellachich upon his office of Ban, all free expression of opinion was prohibited in Croatia. Extraordinary tribunals were established, before which those who dared to oppose the separation of Croatia from Hungary were dragged, and summarily condemned. The Ban ordered that all those should be punished as seditious persons, who should be found informing the peasants that they owed the abolition of the *robot* or soccage dues to the Hungarian diet. The county magistrates were everywhere displaced, and their places filled by the creatures of Jellachich and Gaj. The Ban proceeded to raise recruits, and to levy, by his own authority, compulsory contributions, to enable him to carry on his preparations for a war against Hungary. The people were assured that all that he did was done by the authority of the emperor.

The Hungarian ministry in vain made every attempt to effect an accommodation. They repeatedly requested Jellachich to name the grievances of the Croatian people, promising every guarantee for the preservation of their nationality, and the fulfilment of every reasonable demand. The Palatine summoned him to take a place in the Council of State. He disregarded the summons, denied the authority of the Palatine, and declared the entire separation of Croatia from Hungary. The Palatine of Hungary and the Hungarian ministry then appointed (May 10) Hrabowszky Royal Commissary in Croatia and Slavonia, for the purpose of restoring order and of reëstablishing the authority of the law. This course was authorized by a royal rescript, addressed to the Palatine (May 6). Another royal rescript was (May 7) addressed to Jellachich, in which the king declared his determination to maintain the integrity of the Hungarian crown, and commanded the Ban to submit himself to the commands of the Palatine. The royal mandate was disregarded, and the commission of Hrabowszky remained without effect. Jellachich was summoned to appear before the royal presence, to give an account of his conduct. He neglected the summons, and publicly declared that he was acting in the interests of the

king, and was secure of the royal approbation. The king, by another edict (May 29), forbade the assembling of the diet of Croatia and Slavonia, which Jellachich had illegally summoned by his own authority. This mandate was slighted, like the former. Finally, by a royal decree issued on the 10th of June,* Jellachich was divested of his office of Ban, and of all his military offices.† In the mean time he had actively commenced his preparations for making war upon Hungary, still declaring that he was acting in the service of the emperor and king, and that his object was the preservation of the monarchy. Shortly after the issuing of the decree of the 10th of June, by which he was divested of his dignities, he presented himself at Innspruck, and was warmly received by the imperial family, as the faithful supporter of their cause. He returned to Croatia to continue his preparations for the invasion of Hungary, and was furnished, at first secretly, afterwards more openly, with supplies of arms and money from Vienna.‡ On the opening of the Hungarian diet on the

* We would correct an inadvertence in the article on "Hungary and Austria, in the May number of the Christian Examiner. On page 495, line 27, the reader is requested to substitute "June" for "the following month." These words originally referred to the month of June. The article was, on account of its too great length, retrenched in many parts before sending to the press. Some passages relating to occurrences in May were thus omitted, and, by an oversight, the words "the following month," in the ensuing sentence, were not altered to suit the change.

† The principles which guided the conduct of the Austrian government during this period are well described by Schlesinger, in his *Aus Ungarn*. "The policy of the cabinet of Vienna towards the Magyars, artfully cloaked by the proclamation declaring the Croatian agitator a traitor, and by the declarations of neutrality made by Latour, the Minister of War, in the diet at Vienna, now lies clear before the world. The principles which it followed may be stated in few words:—Ostensible friendship for the Magyars; secret support of the Slavonians in the South; official denial of all share in the Southern Slavonian insurrection; secret subsidies for Jellachich; pretended attempts at mediation, and, at the same time, active agitation to render all reconciliation impossible."

‡ "On the same day that Jellachich was commanded, by a letter from the king, to submit himself to the command of the Hungarian ministry and General Hrabowzky, Latour sent him 50,000 gulden for the payment of his troops, besides arms and ammunition. These supplies were continued through the whole month of August, and the materials of war were chiefly taken from the arsenals in Vienna and Wiener-Neustadt and the equipment stores in Stockerau. As early as the 13th of August, on the day on which the emperor returned to Vienna from Innspruck, Latour believed the preparations of Jellachich so far advanced, that he sent him the necessary means for passing the Drave, two complete pontoon bridges, which were carried through Vienna on more than a hundred wagons to the Glognitz railroad." — Schütte, *Ungarn und der Unabhängigkeitskrieg*.

5th of July, 1848, the Austrian government not being yet in a condition to lay aside disguise, the Palatine, Archduke Stephen, in the name of his Majesty, King Ferdinand the Fifth, called upon the diet to take instant measures for the defence of the country. He declared that his Majesty had heard with great grief and concern of the use which had been made of the royal name by the instigators to rebellion, and assured the Hungarian nation, that the king was resolved to maintain the constitution and the laws, and to guard sacredly the integrity of his Hungarian crown. On the 11th of July, Kossuth, the Minister of Finance, offered in the diet a motion for a levy of men, and a contribution of money for the defence of the country. In the speech which he delivered upon that occasion, he laid before the diet a statement of the relations of Hungary and Croatia. We offer our readers an extract from this portion of his speech, desiring them to bear in mind, that they are not reading an account drawn up for the defence of the Hungarians in foreign countries, but a statement made by a member of the Hungarian ministry to the diet of the nation.

“If the Hungarians had, by any unjust act of theirs, given cause for this rebellion in Croatia, I would call upon them, even now, to quiet this rebellion, not by arms, but by a compliance with the demands of justice. It is known to you, that, even at the time when the nation extended its rights only to the especially privileged, it made Croatia a sharer in every right. The nation has possessed no right, since the days of Árpád, in which Croatia, from the time of its connection with us, has not fully participated. (*Igaz! True!*) But Croatia has not only shared all our rights; it has also received, at our expense, peculiar privileges. We cannot, therefore, find in the past any ground to accuse ourselves, or to feel, if we are forced to take up arms to defend our country, that we ourselves have provoked this insurrection. There is no cause in the past. Did, then, the last diet, which created a new epoch in the life of the nation, make any change in the favorable relations of Croatia with Hungary? I answer, No; those rights which we won for ourselves, we won for them. The freedom which was granted to the people of Hungary was bestowed by the diet also on the people of Croatia; the indemnity which was guaranteed to the nobles of Hungary was extended, at the cost of Hungary, to those of Croatia, which was unable itself to defray this charge.

“In regard to their nationality, concerning which, though only

in consequence of misunderstanding and erroneous representations, they had formerly some anxiety, the last diet, with a view to appeasing this anxiety, decreed that the Croatians had a perfect right, in conformity with their own statutes, to use their own language in their public affairs within the limits of their own country. Their municipal rights have not been retrenched, but, on the contrary, increased. Is there a more important right than that of regulating the mode of choice of the representatives who are called to make the laws, to secure freedom, to defend the country? The diet has said to them, Croatian brothers, decide for yourselves how you will elect your representatives. Thus the last diet has fully recognized the independence of Croatia in regard to the municipal sphere. The decrees of the late diet, then, offer no cause for this rebellion. Is it, then, found in the conduct of the ministry? We have taken a step, Gentlemen, for which we are responsible to you. If this step had produced any effect in quieting the disposition to rebellion, I should gladly have announced it to you. As it is, I come to you with the confession that we have gone beyond the letter of the law. But we have gone beyond it, because we believed it impossible not to accept the natural consequences of the law. Since the diet had recognized the right of the Croatians to use their own language in their own internal affairs, the ministry believed itself justified in extending this recognition of their nationality to the governmental communications. It therefore resolved, that, in its correspondence with Croatia, a Croatian translation should be placed beside the Hungarian, and that decrees should be issued in this manner. The Croats attach great importance to the power of the Ban. The last diet not only left the power of the Ban of Croatia entire, but secured to him an influence in the government of the whole kingdom, by passing a law in virtue of which he was admitted to a place in the State Council of the Palatine. The ministry, therefore, immediately summoned the Ban, — this Ban whom the power which fell under the scourge of truth and freedom imposed on us, as a curse, in the last moments of its existence, to try whether the demon of reaction might not, by his means, be conjured up, — the ministry summoned this Ban to take his place in the Council of State, in order to confer with the ministry as to the means of restoring tranquillity and order in Croatia. The ministry at the same time called upon him to present the demands of the Croats, declaring themselves ready to grant every just demand, if it came within their power; if not, they pledged themselves to lay a bill to this effect before the representatives of the nation, and to make its acceptance the condition of their continuance in office. The Ban did not appear; he obstinately rejected the summons, and, placing himself at the head

of the rebellious party in Croatia, openly proclaimed the separation of that country from the Hungarian crown.

“I do not deny that Croatia has special grievances which have not yet been redressed ; but for these neither the nation nor the ministry is responsible. These grievances are an inheritance bequeathed by the former government. The nation has always made these griefs its own, and has attempted by every means to obtain their redress, as that of their own grievances. The desire to take instant measures for the redress of these grievances was, indeed, one of the motives which induced us to call upon Jellachich, as the Ban named by his Majesty, to enter into an understanding with the ministry ; for the ministry considered itself not merely empowered, but bound, wherever the law had been violated, to reinstate it in its integrity. The Ban has, however, by his rebellion, cut off the ministry from all possibility of making known to the Croats its decisions in regard to the petition presented to his Majesty by the diet of the province in 1845. Yet the ministry, under these circumstances, neglected nothing which could conduce to the restoration of quiet in Croatia and the frontier districts. The last diet gave the frontier districts the right of representation. They obtained, therefore, a right which they had never possessed since the military organization of the frontier. The ministry has not only taken every measure which lay in its power for causing this to go into effect, but has left nothing untried by which it could hope to conciliate the population of the frontier. It has commissioned General Hrabowszky as Royal Commissary, and empowered him to give to the inhabitants of the frontier the property of the land, in the same manner as it has been bestowed on the urbarial tenants in Hungary proper. It empowered him to abolish the *robot* due to the state ; it empowered him to permit the inhabitants of the frontier the exercise of various branches of trade and manufacture, from which they had been excluded ; it empowered him to afford every facility for free migration. At the same time, the ministry summoned the people to choose, according to communities or districts, men who should lay before the ministry the wishes of the people, that, if any thing yet remained which could justly be accorded to them, the ministry might immediately grant it. These unfortunate, deluded people have answered with riot and insurrection, so that there has been no opportunity for carrying into effect the beneficial measures on which the ministry resolved weeks ago. In a word, we have neglected nothing consistent with the freedom and rights of the nation to effect a conciliation. There has not, therefore, been the slightest cause given, either by the ministry or the nation, for the Croatian rebellion.

“Truly it is a strange thing. When a nation, believing it has

too little freedom, takes up arms in order to obtain greater, it is a doubtful game; for such arms are double-edged. Yet this I can understand. But when a people says, — ‘Your freedom is too great for me; I do not want what you give me; I go to bow down under the old absolutism,’ — this is what I cannot understand.”

The bill for a levy of men and contribution of money for the defence of the country was passed by the diet. But the ministry did not cease their efforts to bring about a peaceful accommodation. These efforts were without success. Jellachich demanded, as the first condition of a suspension of his hostile preparations, the relinquishment, on the part of the Hungarians, of the concession obtained from the king in March, of a separate ministry for war and finance. The news received in the last of July, of the successes of Radetsky in Italy, having restored the confidence of the Austrian government, the disguise which had, for some weeks, been less carefully maintained, was now laid aside. Supplies were forwarded to Jellachich with scarcely the affectation of concealment. In the last week of August, the imperial troops, under the command of Hrabowszky, marched towards Zagráb, at the summons of Jellachich, and placed themselves under his standard. On the 31st of August, the troops of the Ban took possession of the free port of Fiume, in the name of the emperor and king of Croatia. On the same day an autograph letter was addressed to the Palatine of Hungary by the king, expressing his approbation of an accompanying memorial, drawn up by the Vienna ministry, in which it was declared that the concessions granted to the Hungarians in March were illegal, on the ground that they were inconsistent with the Pragmatic Sanction, and that the king had, consequently, exceeded his powers in granting them. On the 4th of September, Jellachich was reinstated in his office of Ban, and in all his dignities, civil and military. On the 9th of the same month, he passed the Drave, and began the invasion of Hungary at the head of the imperial forces. The war which ensued is the war which is treated of in the *North American Review* for January, 1850, in the article entitled “The War of Races in Hungary.”

The view which the writer in the *North American*

takes of this war, and by which he justifies the title which he has given to his article, is, that it was a contest between the Magyars and the other races inhabiting Hungary, from September, 1848, until April, 1849; that it first became a war between Hungary and Austria, after the publication of the Hungarian manifesto of April, 1849, declaring the expulsion of the house of Hapsburg from the throne; which manifesto was called forth, according to him, by the liberal provisions of the constitution of Ollmütz, proclaimed by the Emperor Francis Joseph, in March, 1849. Up to this period, he represents the Austrian government as favoring now one, now the other, of the contending parties, as appeared most serviceable to its interests at the time. These views are set forth in a sort of summary of the principal features of the war, with which the Reviewer opens his subject.

“ Though the war in Hungary began as early as September, 1848, a declaration of independence was not adopted by the Hungarian diet till the middle of April, 1849. *In the intervening months*, though much blood was shed, and the contest was waged with great exasperation on both sides, it had the aspect of a civil war between different portions of the same empire, the weight of imperial authority being thrown alternately on either side, according as the vicissitudes of the conflict caused the one or the other party to adopt a position which was more favorable to the interests of the emperor. *Thus Jellachich and his army were at first denounced by the imperialists as rebels; and, after the Slavonic rebellion in Bohemia had been crushed by the bombardment of Prague, the Austrian Marshal Hrabowski, commenced a campaign against the favorers of that rebellion in Croatia and Slavonia also*, while the Hungarians, acting on the side of the imperialists, menaced the same countries with invasion from the north.” — *N. A. Review*, January, 1850, pp. 79, 80.

There was no vacillation, or appearance of vacillation, on the part of the Austrian government, during the period of which the Reviewer speaks. From the time that the preparations for the invasion of Hungary were completed, absolute submission, the resignation of the concessions of March, the surrender of the independence of their country, were the only conditions on which Austria would offer peace to the Hungarians. The events which

the Reviewer cites as taking place between September, 1848, and April, 1849, and from which he infers the undecided conduct of Austria during that period, actually took place in the period which intervened between March, 1848, — when the Hungarians accomplished their peaceful revolution, — and August of the same year, the period during which the Austrian government was still obliged to temporize, and to disavow in public the measures which it directed in secret. The proclamation by which Jellachich was declared a rebel bears date the 10th of June, 1848. Hrabowszky was appointed Royal Commissary in Croatia and Slavonia, in consequence of the illegal and arbitrary proceedings of Jellachich, on the 10th of May, 1848. This commission was renewed and confirmed on the 10th of June, when Jellachich was deposed from his office. Hrabowszky resigned his troops to Jellachich in the last week of August, 1848.

“But the Austrian cabinet,” continues the Reviewer, “soon found that Jellachich was less to be dreaded than Kossuth, and that the Slavonians were disposed to be more loyal subjects than the Magyars. By a sudden shift of policy, therefore, the Croats were taken into favor, and their redoubtable Ban, at the head of his army, was commissioned by the emperor to put down the insurrection in Hungary.” — p. 80.

The appointment of Jellachich as Royal Commissary in Hungary, with full powers, civil and military, was made public on the 3d of October, 1848. Of the events enumerated by the Reviewer as occurring during the months which intervened between September, 1848, and April, 1849, this is the only one which comes within the specified period.

“Still,” proceeds the Reviewer, “the Hungarians did not declare their independence of Austria, till the young emperor proclaimed a new and very liberal constitution for all his subjects, of whatever race, language, or province, in March, 1849.” — p. 80.

The Hungarians have always asserted their independence of Austria. The attempts of the Austrian government to subvert that independence have been the cause of the struggle of three centuries, which they have maintained against their kings of the house of Hapsburg. The jealous watchfulness with which they guarded their

rights was lulled, for a brief period, by the subtle policy of Maria Theresa ; but when her son, Joseph the Second, attempted to govern Hungary as a province of the Austrian dominions, the nation rose, forced him to recede from his pretensions, and revoke his illegal edicts. On the accession to the throne of Leopold the Second, the brother of Joseph, in 1790, the Hungarians demanded and obtained from him the fullest acknowledgment of the independence of their country. The tenth article of the acts passed by the diet of 1790, and sanctioned by the king, is as follows :—

“ Hungary is a free and independent kingdom, in no way subordinate to any other people or kingdom, and is to be governed by its lawfully crowned king, not according to the customs of the other hereditary dominions, but according to its own laws, rights, and customs.”

When, after the peace of 1815, Francis the First, the successor of Leopold, attempted to govern Hungary “ according to the customs of the other hereditary dominions,” the attempt was vigorously and successfully repelled. He was forced to recognize the fact, that, though emperor in Austria, he was only the constitutional king of Hungary. In the spring of 1848, the Hungarians obtained the recognition, in the fullest terms, of the independence of their country, and secured, as they believed, not merely the verbal recognition, but the actual possession, of their constitutional rights, by the formation of an independent, responsible Hungarian ministry.

It was this independence, thus guaranteed, that the Hungarians were resolved, at every other sacrifice, to maintain ; it was this independence that the Austrian government was resolved, at whatever cost of perfidy and violence, to subvert. When the preparations for the invasion of Hungary were completed, and the intention of the Austrian government to reduce Hungary to the condition of a province of the empire was apparent, the deputation which was sent by the Hungarian diet to make a last appeal to the conscience of the king, while they declared their unshaken loyalty to his person, firmly asserted the independence of their country as regarded Austria, reminding him that Hungary was “ not a province conquered by force of arms, but a free country,

whose independence he had himself confirmed and ratified by his coronation oath."

In the protest issued by the Hungarian diet against the arrangement made in the imperial family, on the 2d of December, 1848, by which Ferdinand was removed from the throne, and the young prince, Francis Joseph, appointed in his place, the independence of Hungary is declared in the most express terms. The following is an extract from this protest:—

"Hungary, and the countries and districts annexed to it, are not, and never have been, parts of the Austrian dominions, but form an independent country, which possesses its own constitution, and can only be governed according to its own laws, framed with the consent of the people."

No declaration of independence can be more explicit than this, made by the diet on the 7th of December, 1848, three months before the publication of the constitution of Ollmütz.

In the Hungarian manifesto of April 14th, 1849, the independence of Hungary is asserted, not as a new claim, but as an existing fact. The object of this manifesto was to announce to the rest of Europe, and to the world, the expulsion of the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine from the throne of Hungary, and to declare the causes which had compelled the Hungarian nation to this act. These causes are declared to be the many acts of treason and perfidy committed by this house against the Hungarian nation; the stirring up of insurrection among the people, with a view to involve the country in the horrors of a civil war, in order the more easily to effect its subjugation; the attempt to dismember the kingdom; the attempt to destroy the independent political existence of the country by force of arms, and the calling in the forces of a foreign power to aid in the accomplishment of these objects.

The bond of connection which a common sovereign had formed between Hungary and Austria was broken by the abdication of Ferdinand, in December, 1848. Francis Joseph never became lawfully king of Hungary. The consent of the Hungarian diet was never asked to the arrangement by which he was appointed to the throne. Even if he had been the lawfully crowned

king of Hungary, he had no power to make the smallest change in the constitution without the consent of the diet, much less to abolish it altogether. The constitution of Ollmütz, therefore, as regarded Hungary, was a nullity. It was of importance only as proving the intention of Francis Joseph to destroy completely the independent existence of Hungary, in case he should succeed in establishing his dominion over that country by conquest. The Reviewer takes it for granted that the Hungarians were left in undisturbed possession of the concessions granted them in March, 1848. On the same page in which he tells of the promulgation of this constitution of Ollmütz, which incorporated Hungary with the Austrian empire, he talks about the independence of the Hungarians having been "*amply secured by the concessions of the emperor the year before, concessions which made the connection of Hungary with Austria merely nominal*"! He can find, therefore, no other motive for the war, on the part of the Hungarians, than the desire to enslave and oppress their countrymen of different race, while Austria, according to him, engages "in a crusade for the purpose of forcing a liberal constitution on feudal and aristocratic Hungary" (p. 121).*

As the account quoted above (*ante*, p. 304) of the character of the Hungarian war from September, 1848, to April, 1849, is the very first statement made in regard to it by the North American Reviewer, and immediately follows his announcement of his authorities, it will be supposed that here, at least, they will be found to sustain him. Let us consult upon this point De Langs-

* The constitution of Ollmütz was not more popular with Slavonians than with Magyars. The following account of its reception in Croatia is taken from the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for September, 1849: —

"Austria begins to feel the embarrassments of the charter of Ollmütz. We have already several times given our opinion of this charter. Instead of the individual crowns of Hungary, Bohemia, Croatia, Galicia, &c., there is now only one crown, the imperial diadem of Austria, worn by a prince who is no longer the feudal sovereign of subjects independent of each other, but the chief of a great administration in which they are all melted, the first *employé* of a vast bureaucratic hierarchy which incloses them all in its meshes, without distinction of tongue or race. This is the present which was made to the Slavonians, so jealous of their origin, as soon as they had been driven from the diet of Kremsier. The present is not accepted without resistance. The national council of the Croats, which deliberates at Agram, has broken openly with the Ban Jellachich, who is imposing upon it by force the Austrian constitution."

dorff, one of the principal authorities of the writer of "The War of Races." In an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, dated October 15, 1848, De Langsdorff speaks expressly of the war then going on in Hungary, as a war between Austria and Hungary. He says:—

"The quarrel between the Croats and the Magyars has now become the war between Austria and Hungary, and the Ban of Croatia, named Lieutenant-General of the Emperor, commands, by this title, the Austrian troops which have marched from the Drave towards the Danube."

The following is the account given by De Langsdorff of the progress of events from March to September, 1848. We would request our readers to bear in mind that they are reading the words of one who has no intention of making a representation favorable to the Hungarians.

"The period whose principal events we recount may be thus divided:— 1st. From the 16th of March, the date of the revolution, until the 5th of July, the date of the opening of the diet. The Austrian government, broken by blow after blow in its own capital, repelled in Italy, fugitive at Innsbruck, drops the reins, and delivers itself up without resistance to all the demands of the Hungarians. 2d. In July and August, resistance is organized at Vienna; the opposition which the revolutionary measures of the Hungarian ministry meet is encouraged, or at least tolerated. The two governments yet observe appearances in words, but both see that a contest is inevitable; the contest is delayed until the first days of September. 3d. From this period, hostile resolutions are taken on both sides; manifestoes call to arms. In the first week of September, Jellachich takes the command of all the imperial troops assembled in the three counties of Croatia and Slavonia. The Austrian Marshal Hrabowszky, under whose command they were placed, resigns them to him without complaint or resistance."

When the reader of "The War of Races" has advanced about forty-five pages in that article, he will receive from the Reviewer himself a wholly different representation of the course of events from that given in the beginning of the article. On page 123, he will learn that the bombardment of Prague—which according to the first statement occurred at some time between September, 1848, and April, 1849—took place on the "15th of June." Following the course of the Reviewer's narration, it will

appear that Jellachich was proclaimed a traitor, and Hrabowszky commissioned to act in Croatia and Slavonia, at some time between the bombardment of Prague and a meeting which took place between Batthyányi and Jellachich "in July, 1848." The "sudden shift of policy" by which "the Croats were taken into favor, and their redoubtable Ban commissioned to put down the insurrection in Hungary" (p. 80), took place, according to this second account (p. 125), soon after this meeting between Batthyányi and Jellachich in July.

"A conference between Jellachich and Bathiany at Vienna, in July, 1848, only showed that the hostility of the two races was implacable. When they separated, the latter exclaimed, 'We shall meet again on the Drave,' the northern boundary of Croatia. 'No,' answered Jellachich, 'but on the Danube.' The Ban then proceeded to Innspruck, where he satisfied his royal master that his countrymen would gladly continue their allegiance to the house of Austria, if they should be allowed to retain their language, and to enjoy those rights which the emperor had promised to all his subjects. To contend against them, he said, was only to assist the Magyars; for if subdued, they must become subjects of Hungary, which country now retained only a nominal connection with the empire, &c. . . . These reasons appearing conclusive, the emperor did not hesitate *at once to change sides, to unite the imperial forces with those he had just before denounced as rebels, and to commission the Ban Jellachich himself, the chief rebel, to put down the insurrection in Hungary.*" — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. pp. 124, 125.

What insurrection the Ban could find in Hungary to put down, unless it was that of the Servians, or the one which he was himself engaged in fomenting, it would not be easy to show. The Reviewer himself has not intimated, that, up to this time, any insurrectionary act had been committed by the Hungarians, or that they had even made preparation to repel invasion. The measures taken by the diet for the defence of the country, which he proceeds to relate, were, according to his own account, made after the arrangement had been concluded by which the Ban was to invade Hungary with the imperial forces.

"This arrangement, however," proceeds the Reviewer, "was kept secret for a time, to await the result of negotiations with the Magyars." — p. 125.

In the article on "The Politics of Europe," the Reviewer offers another reason for this secrecy:—

"It is not surprising that the Austrian ministers should at last open their eyes to this state of things, and resolve upon a sudden change of measures; but, *with their usual tortuous policy, they kept this resolution secret as long as they could, in order to take the Magyars unawares.*" — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 505.

Leaving our readers the choice of motives for Austrian dissimulation which the Reviewer offers them, we proceed with his narration.

"But this haughty and imperious race," he continues, "waited for no compromise."

The Hungarian ministry, who had from the first used every effort to avert from their country the horrors of war, and to take from Austria all pretext for armed invasion, did not cease from their exertions, even after the designs of the Austrian government were no longer doubtful. The conference which Batthyányi had with Jellachich in July, at Vienna, took place more than a month after the interview between Jellachich and the emperor at Innsbruck (June 19th), and a fortnight after the diet had passed the measures for the defence of the country, which the Reviewer cites in proof that the Hungarians "waited for no compromise." In this conference Batthyányi requested Jellachich to name the demands of the Croats. The Ban refused to enter into any negotiations with the Hungarians until they relinquished the concessions made them by the king in the month of March, of a separate ministry for the departments of war and finance; he demanded that these departments should be once more placed under the control of the Austrian ministry. Batthyányi replied, that this was a question between Hungary and Austria, and once more desired Jellachich to name the desires of the Croatian people. The Ban, in his character of champion of the "unity of the Austrian empire," remained obstinate, and demanded the surrender of the independence of Hungary as the condition upon which he would agree to suspend his hostile preparations. The conference remained, of course, without result. Even after the Austrian government had declared itself openly by the retraction of the concessions

of March, and while Jellachich, in command of the imperial forces, was threatening instant invasion, the Hungarians made yet another attempt to avert the war, by a direct appeal to their king. Even when this had failed, and the invasion of the country had already begun, they did not desist from their efforts to effect an accommodation. They sent a deputation to lay their cause before the Austrian diet, in order to obtain the mediation of that body. We will give the account of the failure of this embassy in the words of a member of the Austrian diet, — Dr. Fuster, formerly Professor of Theology in the University of Vienna.

“The 19th of September was a mournful day. Deputies from the noble Hungarian nation knocked at the doors of the Austrian diet and begged admission. A people desired to open their hearts to another people, to secure their mediation in order to avert inexpressible calamities. The servility of the Centre, the heartlessness and fanaticism of the Bohemians, drove them from the door, — yes, drove them even with insult. . . . Löhner’s admirable, prophetic speech did not avail to defend the noble, unfortunate Magyars from the low scorn of the Bohemians, who on that day gave proof of a meanness such as no other people has ever displayed. Rieger spoke afterwards, in Kremsier, like a Jupiter Tonans against tyranny, but in September he himself behaved like a mean tyrant towards the Magyars. And the centralists, — the servile souls who have always the welfare of Austria in their mouths, — what regard did they show for the welfare of Austria, when they gave their vote for the exclusion of the Hungarian deputation?” *

All the attempts to effect a negotiation, which the Hungarians subsequently made, only proved to them that the sacrifice of the independence of their country was the only price at which they could hope to obtain peace; at this cost they could not purchase it.

We return to the Reviewer’s account of the events of July.

“But this haughty and imperious race waited for no compromise, and their spirits only rose as the number of their enemies increased. Their diet voted an extraordinary contribution of a hundred millions of florins, a levy of two hundred thousand men,

* *Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wiener Revolution*, von Dr. Anton Fuster. Frankfort am Main. 1850.

and an issue of two hundred millions of paper money. It was also proposed to recall the Hungarian regiments that were serving under Radetsky in Lombardy; but Kossuth cried out, 'Beware what you do! They are Croats and Slavonians whom you wish to recall.' The old liberal party of the constitutional opposition in the diet, led by such men as Széchény and Deak, and even Bathiany, who was far more radical in his politics, protested against these headlong proceedings, and recommended delay and negotiation; but the danger was imminent, the excitement was intense, and, as usual in such cases, the fanatics and ultra-ists, headed by Kossuth and Szémeré, carried every thing their own way."

It was on the 11th of July, 1848,* that the Hungarian diet, on the motion of Kossuth, minister of finance, voted a levy of two hundred thousand men, — forty thousand of whom were to be raised immediately, and the rest in case of necessity, — for the defence of the country. They likewise voted a contribution of forty-two millions of florins for the equipment and maintenance of the troops. These measures were not, as the Reviewer supposes, an act of open defiance to the Austrian government. The schemes of that government were, indeed, no longer concealed from the Hungarian ministry. It was now known to them, that the dangers which threatened the country proceeded from that quarter. They did not, however, depart from a strictly legal course. The measures which were proposed by the ministry and adopted by the diet, on the 11th of July, were in accordance with the royal will, as expressed in the speech from the throne, delivered by the Palatine (the Archduke Stephen), in the name of the king, at the opening of the diet. At the time that Kossuth offered the motion for the levy of two hundred thousand men, and a grant of money for their support, he announced his intention of afterwards preparing a plan for raising a portion of the amount voted, either by loan or an issue of paper money; he laid his plan before the diet in August, and, on the 5th of that month, an issue of twelve and a half millions of paper money, against a deposit of five millions in specie, was decreed. The

* Szilágyi, *A Magyar Forradalom Története*, 93. Schutte, *Ungarn und der Ungarische Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, II. 68-80. Frey, *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*, I. 87.

amount of the issue was increased to sixty-one millions, towards the end of August, when the invasion of the country was daily expected to take place.

The objections offered by Kossuth to the proposal for the recall of the Hungarian troops serving in Italy were made in his speech of the 20th of July, when the royal demand for recruits for the army in Italy was under debate in the diet. The reader will find the *North American Reviewer*, in "The Politics of Europe,"* referring to the proceedings in the diet on that day,— nine days after the passing of the measures for the defence of the country which he here supposes to have been the signal of a final rupture with Austria,— in proof of the conservative dispositions of the Hungarian ministry.

The measures adopted by the diet, on the 11th of July, for the defence of the country, which measures the *Reviewer* supposes to have been protested against by "the old liberal party," by Széchenyi,† Deák, and Batthyányi, were passed, not only without opposition, but without discussion.‡ When Kossuth concluded his speech with a motion for a levy of troops for the defence of the country, and the necessary supplies for their equipment and support, Paul Nyáry rose, and, almost before the last words were pronounced, said, in a voice which resounded through the hall, "We give it." The whole house rose, with one unanimous *Megadjuk!* (We give it!) and, when the tempest of applause had subsided, the

* See *North American Review*, April, 1850, p. 499. The *Reviewer* there speaks of the debates in the diet, on the subject of recruits for the army in Italy, as taking place in *May*. The diet was not in session during the month of May. The last diet at Presburg was closed on the 11th of April. The next diet was opened at Pest on the 5th of July. The debates on the Italian question took place on the 20th of that month. In the *North American Reviewer's* last article on Hungary, the date of this debate is given, — 20th July, 1848. See *North American Review*, January, 1851, p. 233.

† M. Pulszky (formerly Secretary of State to Ferdinand the Fifth, king of Hungary), in his introduction to Schlesinger's "War in Hungary," says that Széchenyi "acted throughout in accordance with his colleagues; as minister from March, 1848, until September of the same year, he was never opposed to Kossuth; it was even Széchenyi, not Kossuth, who originated the proposition in the ministerial cabinet to issue Hungarian paper money." — Vol. I. p. 83.

‡ See Szilágyi, Schütte, Frey, &c. De Langsdorff, one of the *Reviewer's* chief authorities, speaks of these measures as having passed "by acclamation." See *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Oct., 1848, p. 263.

President announced that the motion of Kossuth had been adopted unanimously.

"It was when defeated in debate on this occasion," continues the Reviewer, "that the noble Széchenyi, seeing that his influence was lost, and the fate of his country was sealed by the madness of its demagogues, made an attempt upon his own life."

Széchenyi's melancholy derangement, occasioned by his apprehensions for the fate of his country, did not overtake him until September, nearly two months after the passage of the measures of the 11th of July. He took a part in the debates during the month of August. He left Pesth, on account of the deranged state of his nerves, on the 5th of September, and his illness, in consequence of extreme distress of mind, rapidly increased, until it ended in derangement.*

"The magnates generally," continues the Reviewer, "abandoned the cause at this crisis; they would not fight against their countrymen, but neither could they lead them onwards to certain destruction. They retired to their estates, or left the country. Kossuth and the untitled nobles, assisted by the peasants of their race, alone provoked the contest; and never did a large body of men fight more gallantly in support of an unwise, unjust, and desperate undertaking.

"Their situation, indeed, was perilous in the extreme. *Early in September, 1848, Jellachich took the command of all the imperial troops in Croatia and Slavonia, the Austrian Marshal Hrabowsky quietly resigning his post to him, and prepared to cross the Drave and march upon Pesth.*"—p. 126.

On page 79, as we have seen, this month of September makes the commencement of the period during which the contest had the aspect of a civil war, "the weight of imperial authority being thrown alternately on either side."

* The account given by Széchenyi's physician, Dr. Balogh, of the progress of his illness, is extremely affecting. He was with great difficulty persuaded to leave Buda-Pesth by Dr. Balogh, who assured him that the only hope of recovery lay in an instant departure from the scenes of excitement around him. He left, attended by his physician, on the 5th of September. When he had gone a short distance from the city, he sprang from the carriage, declaring that he could not leave his post, but that he would return to die with his countrymen. He was taken back to the carriage almost by force. On his journey, his disease rapidly gained ground, fits of deep melancholy alternating with accessions of frantic despair, until his reason was completely overthrown. See *A Magyar Forradalom Férfiai (The Men of the Hungarian Revolution)*, Szilágyitól. Pesten, 1850.

But here we find that, early in that month, the "arrangement" made at Innsbruck was carried into effect, and that Jellachich then took the command of the imperial troops, and began the invasion of Hungary.

If the reader will now turn to the article on "The Politics of Europe," he will be presented with yet another view of affairs. The denunciation of Jellachich as a traitor, and the commission of Hrabowszky, which, in "The War of Races," are enumerated among the acts of the Austrian government that prove the vacillation of that government during the period which intervened between *September, 1848, and April, 1849*, are brought forward, in "The Politics of Europe," to prove that the Imperialists and the Magyars were firm allies during *the spring and summer of 1848*.

"The Imperialists and Magyars acted as firm and independent allies during the spring and summer of 1848, the latter having achieved a virtual independence. . . . Austria and the Magyars acted as allies in a reciprocity of services. Kossuth and his party sent 40,000 troops to assist the emperor in crushing his revolted subjects in Lombardy; Ferdinand, in return, denounced Jellachich and Raiachich, the Croats and the Servians, as rebels when they attempted to shake off the Magyar yoke, and sent one of his field-m Marshals, Hrabowski, to command the Imperialist-Magyar force which attacked Carlowitz." — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 502.

The sudden shift of policy, which on page 80 is represented as terminating, at some indefinite period between September, 1848, and April, 1849, the vacillation of the Austrian government (*ante*, p. 305) which (on page 125) is supposed to have preceded the vote of the diet (July 11, 1848) for the levy of two hundred thousand men for the defence of the country, — a measure instigated, as the Reviewer there says, by this increase in the number of their enemies (*ante*, p. 312), — is on page 505 asserted to have taken place in August.

"But in August the Austrian ministry began to see that they had committed a great mistake in allying the imperial cause with the Magyars rather than with the Slavonians," &c. "Arms and encouragement were secretly furnished to the Croats and Servians, and a plan of conduct was probably arranged by the *Ban Jellachich on his visit to the emperor at Innsbruck in August*." — *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. pp. 505, 506.

In his last article upon Hungary (January, 1851), the Reviewer brushes away, without ceremony, the several theories he has propounded in his preceding ones. The proclamation by which Jellachich was declared a traitor, — this proclamation which, as we have seen, was adduced in the opening of "The War of Races" in proof of the vacillating conduct of Austria between September, 1848, and April, 1849, — this proclamation which in "The Politics of Europe" (p. 502) formed the emperor's share of the "reciprocity of services" which took place between Austria and Hungary during the spring and summer of 1848, — was, according to the Reviewer's latest supposition, *never issued by Ferdinand at all*. This document is now discovered to be a forgery. The Reviewer has been converted to this belief by the following passage from Count Mailáth.

"The Magyar ministry tried in vain various means to bring the Ban into subjection. He was summoned to Buda-Pesth; he did not come. A royal commissioner, General Hrabowsky, was ordered into Croatia; but he was not disposed to enter the province. The Ban was called to Innsbruck to answer for his conduct; he obeyed, and soon convinced the emperor that he wished only the welfare of the monarchy and the dynasty. On his journey home, he learned from a newspaper that he was deposed; but Croatia continued to obey him, and soon a *royal ordinance appeared which reinstated him in his dignity and office*. This deposition of the Ban was one of the most enigmatical occurrences of the time. Of the numerous reports which were circulated in reference to it, the most probable one is, that the President of the Magyar ministry, who was for some time in Innsbruck, by some unknown means, obtained the emperor's signature to a blank sheet of paper, and then, without the emperor's knowledge, filled it out with the deposition of the Ban. This report was somewhat confirmed by the fact, that *not the slightest protest was made by the Hungarian ministry when the Ban continued in the execution of his office*; the Magyar ministry dreaded any thorough investigation of this matter." — Mailáth, as cited in the *N. A. Review*, January, 1851, pp. 221, 222.

Why, we would ask, was the Ban *reinstated* if he had never been deposed? The royal ordinance by which he was reinstated appeared on the 4th of September, when all the preparations for the attack upon Hungary were completed, and five days before the actual invasion of the country. In this second decree, the authenticity of

the first is explicitly recognized. The king thus expresses himself: —

“It affords peculiar satisfaction to my paternal heart, that I can retract that sentence which I was induced to pronounce, in my manifesto of the 10th of June last, in regard to an inquiry to be instituted against you, and in regard to your temporary removal from the dignity of Ban, and from all military offices, upon the ground of a supposition which finds the fullest refutation in your tried, loyal devotion.” *

In regard to the “*fact*, that not the slightest protest was made by the Hungarian ministry when the Ban continued in the execution of his office,” in which Count Mailáth finds confirmation of the “report” that Batthyányi was guilty of the forgery of the decree by which Jellachich was deposed, the Reviewer might himself have furnished the confutation of this argument. In the memorial, dated July 4th, presented by the Hungarian ministry to the Archduke Stephen, from which the Reviewer gives an extract on the next page of his review to that on which he quotes Count Mailáth, is found the following passage: —

“We now come to the second point, which we commend to the special attention of his Royal Highness the Archduke John. It is this, that his Majesty can consider neither the deputies of the Agram Congregation, held on the 5th of June, nor the Baron Jellachich individually, as representatives of the Croatian nation. Not the former, inasmuch as his Majesty, our gracious sovereign, having declared the Agram Congregation of the 5th of June to be illegal, his Imperial Royal Highness cannot treat the deputies of that Congregation as the legal representatives of the Slavish states without compromising the royal and legal declaration. Not the latter, since his Majesty has suspended Baron Jellachich, on a charge of rebellion, from all military and civil functions and dignities. And on this point we cannot suppress our great surprise, that, in the note of his Imperial-Royal Highness, the Baron Jellachich is still spoken of as the Ban, a fact we are unable to reconcile with the legal declaration of his Majesty our gracious sovereign.” †

The Reviewer finds an additional proof of the spuriousness of the decree by which Jellachich was removed

* A translation of this document is to be found in the Appendix to Schlesinger's *War in Hungary*, p. 323.

† See Appendix to *The War in Hungary*, by Max Schlesinger, p. 318.

from his office, in what he calls a "gross misstatement of fact in the document itself." This "misstatement of fact" is found in the statement of the fact that Jellachich had been summoned to appear before the emperor, and had neglected to obey the summons. The Reviewer says, that

"Towards the close of it [the proclamation by which Jellachich was deposed] allusion is made to the fact that the emperor had summoned Jellachich to come before him and defend his conduct, which summons, *it is foolishly alleged*, he had refused to obey." "Now, *it is notorious* that he did appear before the emperor at Innsbruck, in June, as summoned, and *there* had an interview with the chiefs of the Magyar ministry, Bathiany, Széchény, Esterhazy, and others, which interview terminated with the celebrated mutual defiance:— 'We shall meet again on the Drave!' said Bathiany. 'No,' answered Jellachich, 'but on the Danube.' And he kept his word. This gross misstatement of fact in the instrument itself is alone enough to prove Count Mailath's statement, that the whole document was a forgery, or was obtained by surreptitious means."—*N. A. Review*, Jan., 1851, p. 221.

Jellachich certainly appeared at Innsbruck in June, but not until after the decree by which he was deprived of his office had been issued. This decree is dated the 10th of June. The interview which Jellachich had with the emperor at Innsbruck took place on the 19th of that month, as he himself states in the proclamation, dated at Innsbruck, which he addressed on the next day to the frontier regiments in the army in Italy. The date of this interview is given in two of the works to which the Reviewer refers as authorities in his last article.

The Reviewer himself does not appear to have been always so well assured of the time and circumstances of this "notorious" interview. Let the reader compare with the above account from the *North American Review* for January, 1851, the following from the *North American Review* for January, 1850:—

"The emperor, who, in the middle of May, had secretly left his capital and taken refuge at Innsbruck, temporized at first; but as the conduct of the Czechs at Prague grew more outrageous, he became more hostile to the Slavonian cause, and summoned the Ban to meet him in the Tyrol, and to give an account of his conduct. Jellachich *not only refused*, but attended the

Slavonian diet, which he had called at Agram, where he was formally elected Ban by that assembly, having hitherto held his office by imperial appointment. *The emperor then denounced him as a rebel, and ordered him to be deprived of all his offices and titles.* The Austrian Marshal Hrabowsky, with a considerable body of troops, was sent to enforce these commands by the invasion of Croatia and Slavonia. . . . The haughty and warlike Magyars would make no terms with those whom they regarded as their revolted subjects, whom they had ruled with absolute dominion for eight centuries. A conference between Jellachich and Bathiany, at Vienna, in July, 1848, only showed that the hostility of the two races was implacable. When they separated, the latter exclaimed, 'We shall meet again on the Drave,' the northern boundary of Croatia. 'No,' answered Jellachich, 'but on the Danube.' The Ban then proceeded to Innspruck, where he satisfied his royal master," &c.* (See *ante*, p. 310.)

The North American Reviewer returned to the subject of Hungary in his article on "The Politics of Europe," because he had found, as he says, that "the prejudices of some persons are inveterate" (p. 494). He wrote the second article, of course, to maintain the charges brought against the Hungarians in the first. But we do not find him making any attempt to substantiate the main accusation, enforced by constant repetition, in "The War of Races," namely, that the Hungarians engaged in war for the purpose of maintaining *feudal institutions*. He begins that portion of his new article which relates to Hungary, by laboring very strenuously quite a different point; namely, that they did not wage war "for the establishment of a republic"; as if this were the question at issue. We regard this as a question of minor importance, and one that concerns only the Hungarians themselves. We have no idea that the American people will require, before giving their sympathies to a struggle for freedom, to be satisfied that it had for its object the founding of a government precisely on the model of their own. But since the Reviewer has thought it worth while to devote five or six pages to this subject, and since it has afforded him occasion for a very extraordinary insinuation in regard to the truth of statements contained in the "Brief Explanatory Report," published in New

* *N. A. Review*, January, 1850, pp. 124, 125.

York, by Governor Ujházy, we think it proper to offer a few remarks upon it.

The Hungarians fought for the maintenance of their liberties, and of their constitutional form of government. The war in which they were engaged was a war of defence. They left no honorable means untried to avert it, and, after its commencement, would willingly have accepted such terms of accommodation as did not sacrifice the independence of the country. If the consent of the diet had been asked to the abdication of Ferdinand and the accession of Francis Joseph, — if the young prince had abandoned the iniquitous scheme for the accomplishment of which he was placed upon the throne, the incorporation of Hungary with the Austrian empire, — if he had caused himself to be legally crowned, and had taken the oath to the constitution, — he would, without doubt, have been permitted to wear the crown of Hungary. This would, probably, have appeared to a majority of the intelligent part of the nation the wisest and safest course, while it would have been that most congenial to the feelings and prejudices of the great mass of the people. The conduct of the new emperor soon put an end to all hope of a restoration of tranquillity through a return of the Austrian government to the path of justice and legality, and after the promulgation (in March, 1849) of the constitution of Ollmütz, which annihilated the independent existence of Hungary, had proved the fixed purpose of the house of Hapsburg to persist in its usurpations, the diet passed a decree excluding for ever every member of that perjured and treason-stained house from the throne of Hungary. The choice of a ruler now devolved upon the people. The diet then existing wisely abstained from agitating, at this critical period, any question which could excite a division of parties in the nation. They appointed a temporary governor, leaving the question of the form of government to be thereafter adopted to the decision of the national assembly, when the restored tranquillity of the country should permit the consideration of this question.

There had existed in Hungary, even from the days of March, 1848, a party which desired complete separation from Austria and the abolition of the monarchy. This party was in a decided minority up to the time of

the abdication of Ferdinand and the illegal intrusion of Francis Joseph upon the throne. The entire contempt which was manifested in this proceeding for the compact by which the Hungarian crown had been secured to the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine, took from royalty the support which it had hitherto found in the loyal nature of the Hungarian people. For a time, indeed, they refused to recognize the abdication of their king, and fought in the name of the king of Hungary against the emperor of Austria. But this was too slender a fallacy for them to cling to it long. The entire release of Hungary from all foreign control, and the establishment of a government which should have no interests separate from those of the people, were ideas which were gradually ripening in the public mind. The following extract from the "Explanatory Report" of Governor Ujházy* will give a just idea of the state of political parties in the spring of 1849, at the time of the adoption of the resolution expelling the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine from the throne of Hungary:—

"As in all revolutions, so in ours, there were several parties. There were some who intended to wage this contest simply for the recovery of the constitution of 1848, who wished to keep open a way of retreat, so that they might, in case of an unsuccessful issue, fall back under the Austrian rule.

"Others, of whom I was one, wished to sacrifice their property and their blood for a grander, more worthy object, namely, for a separation from Austria and the founding of a republic.

"In pursuance of this ardent wish, there was formed in March, at first in the bosom of the diet, a Democratic Republican Club, which, holding public sessions and honoring me with the presidency, had for its object the hastening of the declaration of independence, and consultation upon all subjects of interest that might occur.

* Ladislaus Ujházy, Főispán, or Supreme Count of the county of Sáros, and afterwards Governor of Komárom, was one of the earliest members of the republican party in Hungary. An Austrian writer, who has published some volumes of sketches of the leading men in the Hungarian revolution, speaks of Ujházy as a "revenant from the days of Cromwell." This writer, whose sketches are, in general, certainly not too favorable, speaks with entire respect of Ujházy. "Ujházy," he says, "was, apart from his treasonable language, an estimable enemy. He never went in a mask, but always gave himself out for what he was, — a living relic of the Rakóczy time. His motto in the chamber of Magnates was, — 'I am not flattered with a show of freedom.'" See Levitschnigg, *Kossuth und seine Bannerschaft*.

“The members of this society very soon composed a majority, both in the upper house and the house of representatives, so that the then existing government, the so-called Committee of National Defence, under the presidency of Louis Kossuth, felt itself incited to a declaration of independence.

“This resolution was solemnly announced in the cathedral of Debreczin, in the presence of a countless multitude. Kossuth then delivered an eloquent discourse, in which he so powerfully and vividly depicted the injustice, treachery, and perjury, for three centuries practised by Austria upon Hungary, that every hearer uttered curses against that tyrannical and deceitful house.

“On this occasion, Kossuth was appointed, by one universal, thundering acclamation, Governor of the country. This event occurred on the 14th of April. When, shortly after, the Governor having named his new ministry, its President, Bartholemew Szemere, brought forward, with distinguished energy and decision, his republican programme, there followed such a lively expression of applause as I had never before heard, and which sufficiently indicated how well he met the views of the National Assembly, and to what maturity, even at that time, those principles had attained.

“From this decisive epoch onward, the main care of the Hungarian government was to place the administration of the country in the hands of men of purely republican sentiments, who fully approved the declaration of independence.”—*Brief Explanatory Report*, pp. 5, 6.

It is from the statements made in the above extract that the Reviewer dissents, and in terms which imply an imputation of intentional inaccuracy.

“In the ‘Brief Explanatory Report,’ recently published at New York, under the name of Governor Ujhazy, it is admitted (p. 5) that, up to the time when the Hungarians regained possession of their capital, Buda-Pesth, in the spring of 1849, ‘the dispositions of the diet were made purely in the spirit of a constitutional resistance, and the struggle was, so to speak, carried on in the name of the dethroned Ferdinand, against the young usurper, Franz Joseph.’ It is asserted, however, that there was a party formed among the members of the diet, in March, 1849, which had for its object ‘a separation from Austria and the founding of a republic,’—two things which the writer seems to consider as one; for his language in the paragraphs immediately following clearly shows, — probably, as the [London] Examiner suggests in a similar case, from the mistranslation of a Hungarian word, as Governor Ujhazy is ignorant of our language, — that he thought the Declaration of *Independence* was the same thing with the establish-

ment of a *Republic*. He says, for instance, 'From this decisive epoch onward, the main care of the Hungarian government was to place the administration of the country in the hands of men of purely republican sentiments, *who fully approved the Declaration of Independence*,' in which *the name of republic is not once mentioned!* We hope the *English* writer of this pamphlet made no deliberate attempt to obtain an *apparent* sanction of a statement which the Governor's regard for veracity would not allow him to make. But there is a seeming tergiversation in this passage which we are sorry to notice."—*N. A. Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 498.

Is the editor of the *North American Review* ignorant that, in the American Declaration of Independence, the name of *republic* is not once mentioned?

In support of his extraordinary insinuations in regard to the veracity of the statements contained in the "Explanatory Report" of Governor Ujházy, the Reviewer brings forward a statement in regard to the position of parties in Hungary in 1848, purporting to be drawn from a work by Frey, entitled *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*, which was published in Mannheim in 1849. The Reviewer thus introduces Frey to his readers:—

"The position of parties in the Hungarian diet is best explained by Mr. Arthur Frey, in his work published in London, in August, 1849, entitled 'Louis Kossuth and the Recent History of Hungary.' We have not seen this book, but borrow some extracts from it from the London Athenæum, which says, 'The spirit of the work is more than republican; it breathes the hottest aspirations of a party that worship revolution as something like a divine process.' Its authority, therefore, will not be disputed by the sympathizers with Kossuth and his party, especially as we are told that the book was drawn up 'from reports of the Pesth National Assembly,' or Hungarian Diet, with the assistance of Hungarian writers.* Mr. Frey says:—

"The National Assembly consisted of three parties;—1. A section of the aristocracy (Magnates), liberal on the whole, but firmly attached to the Austrian connection; 2. A middle party, *including the new ministry*, whose watchword was the entire independence of a free Hungary, if possible under an Austrian

* [Frey says that his work is compiled with the assistance of Hungarian and Austrian writers, and it is thus quoted in the Athenæum. The part which Austrian writers have had in the work is apparent. Frey's work is valuable for the documents and reports of the debates in the diet which it contains.]

king, if not, under some other sovereign, or form of sovereignty; 3. An extreme radical or revolutionary party, represented by some thirty members.' ”

The passage which is here brought forward to controvert the statements made in Ujházy's "Report" in regard to the position of parties in Hungary in the spring of 1849, after the expulsion of the house of Hapsburg had been decreed, relates to the position of parties in the Hungarian diet in the summer of 1848,— before the concessions of March had been arbitrarily retracted by the king; before the imperial forces had invaded the country; before Francis Joseph had usurped the Hungarian crown; before the octroyed constitution of Ollmütz had decreed the incorporation of Hungary with the Austrian empire.

This passage, moreover, which the Reviewer recommends to his readers on the strength of Frey's "more than republican" principles, is not an extract from the work of Frey, but from the review of the first volume of his work in the London Athenæum. It is a summary of the deductions formed from it, by the writer of that review, in regard to the position of parties in the Hungarian diet in the summer of 1848. It is introduced with "we are told," but does not purport to be an extract, not being distinguished by difference of type or mark of quotation. The writer in the Athenæum makes a number of extracts from the work of Frey, but they are all distinguished in one or the other of these ways from the rest of the article. So far as regards the particular points which the Reviewer designs to enforce, the passage in question is not the expression of the opinions of Frey. The reference to "Kossuth and his party," in the remarks with which the North American Reviewer introduces the extract, and the Italics with which he distinguishes the words "*including the new ministry,*" show to what portion of the passage he wishes to direct the attention of his readers, and what inferences he intends shall be drawn from it. It will be observed, that, in his zeal to prevent Kossuth and his party from being mistaken for republicans, he forgets that this party, "ever since it was organized, has been endeavouring to effect a complete separation from Austria," with a view to the "preservation of feudal

privileges,"* and now indorses, and especially recommends to his readers, a statement that this party desired the independence of a *free* Hungary, "*if possible* under an *Austrian king*." This opinion, however correct, is not that of the "more than republican" Frey.† It is not apparent what bearing the opinions of that writer, or of any other person, in regard to the state of parties in Hungary in the summer of 1848, can have upon the accuracy of Governor Ujházy's statement in regard to the republican sentiments of the men in whose hands the administration of the country was placed in the spring of 1849. But since the Reviewer has thought proper to appeal to Frey's testimony on this point, in support of his charge of "tergiversation," we will lay before our readers that writer's views of the politics of the different members of the ministry in July, 1848. Frey has just been speaking of the debates which took place on the 20th of that month, fifteen days after the opening of the diet, on the subject of granting recruits for the imperial army in Italy.

"The reader has now before him the three most important speeches, which were made in the house of representatives at Pest, in regard to the Italian question, and which, at the same time, characterize the different parties of which the diet consisted. We count now three parties, and the reader will, after he has perused these three speeches, acknowledge the correctness of this view. For, as we perceive from the different speeches of Kossuth and Eötvös, the ministerial party was itself divided into two fractions; into the Batthyányi fraction, to which Eötvös, Déák, Klauzál, Széchényi, Meszáros, belonged, and into the Kossuth fraction, to which the single minister Szemere belonged. The first section had its basis chiefly in the class of magnates, and in the party of those who were attached to the emperor, who preferred to unite themselves with the conciliatory and unionist policy of Batthyányi, rather than with the violent, revolutionary policy of Kossuth."* — *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*, I. 188.

But the special inference which the North American Reviewer plainly intends shall be drawn from the pas-

* *North American Review*, Vol. LXX. p. 111.

† The writer in the *Athenæum* makes it perfectly clear what are Frey's views of the character of Kossuth; he speaks of "*the thorough-going, revolutionary character*" which Frey "*loves to assign to his hero*." — *London Athenæum*, August 25, 1849, p. 855.

‡ We give this extract only as illustrating the views of Frey.

sage which he offers in Frey's name is, that, in case the independence of a free Hungary should prove not to be possible under an Austrian king, the Hungarians still excluded the idea of a republic, and could turn only to "some other sovereign or form of sovereignty." This opinion is certainly not that of Frey. We will now place before our readers that writer's view of the principles which actuated the Hungarian government in the spring of 1849, the period referred to by Ujházy. Frey has just related the unanimous acceptance, by both houses, of the resolution expelling the house of Hapsburg from the throne of Hungary.

"The Hungarian struggle," he proceeds, "now began to assume that import which the *party of the republicans*, Kossuth at their head, the Poles and the many foreigners in the Hungarian army, had been striving to give it. . . . Kossuth had only waited for the favorable moment; he had left the house of Hapsburg time enough to extinguish, by their conduct, the last spark of attachment in the hearts of the people. Now, when the lips of every Magyar had only curses for the hitherto reigning family, Kossuth tore away the veil of constitutionality, with which he had hitherto covered his republican plans; now he showed them boldly; now he spoke it out in thundering tones, that only under a republican form of government could Hungary be free and happy; and the nation, which, perhaps, two months before, would have shuddered at the idea, now shouted forth its joyful and triumphant approbation."—*Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*, III. 13, 14.

We can offer more conclusive evidence than that of Frey, in regard to the political principles of the men in whose hands the government of Hungary was placed in the spring of 1849. The following is an extract from the speech in which Szemere, the head of the ministry appointed by Kossuth, after the adoption of the resolution of the 14th of April, 1849, explained to the diet the principles which were to direct his conduct and that of his colleagues.

"The ministry comes forward with no long programme. Three points, however, must be named. First, the ministry acknowledges itself to be a revolutionary government. It will not, therefore, shrink from any means conducive to the rescue of the country. With the return of peace it will cease to be a revolutionary government; extraordinary measures can be justified

only by extreme necessity. Secondly, the ministry declares itself to have a republican tendency. The enemy of monarchy, it is, in like manner, the enemy of every republic which preaches that 'property is robbery.' It wishes — God permitting — a republic which shall bless rather than shine. Thirdly, the ministry declares itself to have a democratic tendency. It adopts the principle of the sovereignty of the people in all, — yes, in all its consequences." *

One of the principal witnesses brought forward by the North American Reviewer is M. Paul de Bourgoing, *ancien Ministre de France en Russie et en Allemagne*. His evidence is appealed to in the article on "The Politics of Europe," and in the article upon Hungary in the North American Review for January, 1851. The most important extracts given from this writer relate to the affairs of Transylvania. The long extract given on this subject in "The Politics of Europe" is deserving of comment, inasmuch as it contains a quotation from a speech of Wesselényi, so modified, and introduced in such a connection, that this venerable patriot is made to appear the accuser of his countrymen. Before giving this extract, we will offer a few remarks on the political institutions of Transylvania, as they existed before the union with Hungary, and the change which this union introduced.

The institutions of Transylvania differed essentially from those of Hungary. In the latter country, no political distinctions existed founded on difference of race; but one nationality was recognized, — the Hungarian nationality. In Transylvania, on the contrary, three distinct nationalities were recognized, the Magyar, the Saxon, and the Székler. The Magyar, Székler, and Saxon deputies sat in the Transylvanian diet as representatives of their respective nations.† The other races found in Transylvania, the Wallachs, Armenians, &c., had, as nationalities, no political rights. The nobles of these races possessed the right of voting, and were eligible to the

* Levitschnigg, *Königth und seine Bannerschaft*, Pesth, 1850.

† "There are in Hungary many nations, but they are regarded as melted into one, — the Hungarian nation. Slavonian and German magnates and deputies sit in the diet, but they sit there as Hungarians. In Transylvania each nation has its territory which the law assigns it; each nation appears on its own account at the diet, which represents what has been called the Transylvanian trinity." — De Gerando, *La Transylvanie*, p. 51.

diet,* but they sat there as Magyars. Members of these races could likewise appear in the diet as deputies from the free cities; but they did not represent their nation. By the union with Hungary, which was effected in the summer of 1848, all these distinctions were abolished, and the benefits of the Hungarian constitution, which conferred equal rights on all the inhabitants of the country, were extended to Transylvania. The law passed by the diet of Hungary in March, and sanctioned by the king in April, 1848, which made the right of suffrage nearly universal, from the period of the union, had force in Transylvania. Deputies from that country, Saxons and Wallachs, as well as Magyars and Széklers, sat in the Hungarian diet which assembled at Pest in July, 1848.

The same means were used to stir up sedition and insurrection in Transylvania which had been put in practice in Croatia, and among the Servians of Southern Hungary. Austrian and Russian emissaries worked upon the prejudices and excited the ambitious hopes of the ignorant Wallachs. They were assured that the freedom and right to possess land which had recently been bestowed upon them were gifts from the emperor, and that it was the design of the Hungarians to reduce them to servitude. They were reminded that, if Transylvania were once more separated from Hungary, the Wallachs, as the "fourth nation" in Transylvania, would, being the most numerous race, have the control of the country. To these incitements to rebellion was added the influence of the Wallachs from Bucharest, who held forth yet grander views of an independent Rumania, to be formed by the union of all the territory inhabited by the Wallach or Rumanian race.

It is in speaking of the causes which led to the rebellion of the Wallachs, that M. de Bourgoing introduces the passages from the speech of Wesselényi to which we have referred.

"The Wallachians," says M. de Bourgoing, "who are more properly called the *Roumani*, were the last to take up arms; they did not determine upon this step till about the end of October; the Hungarians, they say, have only to thank Kossuth and his party for this hostility, which has been fatal to them, especially in

* De Gerando, *La Transylvanie*, p. 52.

Transylvania. They would have preferred to be on good terms with the Hungarians; and for this end, they asked only the recognition of their nationality, and the freedom that had been promised without distinction in the Hungarian constitution to all the races inhabiting the kingdom. The moderate party among the Magyars were quite willing to assent to the just demands of a people who were the natural allies of their race. It was thus that Count Wesselényi, a blind old man, who sat in the diet at Pesth, remarked in the session of the 29th of May:— ‘The horizon of my country is darker than the night of my eyes; our only means of safety consist in holding out a fraternal hand to the Roumani, and proposing an intimate alliance with them; for, like them, we, too, are isolated in the vast ocean of nations; our interests, as well as theirs, require a close alliance between us. I ask you, therefore, to pass a law that the nationality of the Roumani shall be respected.’ Kossuth rejected the motion, declaring that he knew nothing either of a Roumanic or a Croatian people, and that he recognized only Hungarian citizens. All the nationalities were thus trodden under foot; and the most odious acts soon followed, and completed the exasperation of these races. It was thus that the union of Transylvania with Hungary was decreed without asking the consent of the Roumani, who form a great majority of the population of the former province; it was thus that ultra-Magyar commissioners were sent to different localities with orders to exterminate the men of capacity and education (meaning thereby the schoolmasters and the priests, without whose direction the rude Wallachian peasants could do no harm); it was thus that in the neighbourhood of the cities and villages, and even on the highways, gibbets were erected, and on the public edifices in every part of Transylvania these words were inscribed, in the Hungarian and Roumani language, — *Union or Death.*

“The Roumani, driven to extremities, assembled, in the month of May, 1848, at Balasfalva, to the number of sixty thousand, presided over by their bishops of the Greek Church. Images of Trajan and Aurelian, and standards bearing the letters S. P. Q. R., reminded this multitude of their ancestors. The assembly discussed this question with great order and decorum; the result of their deliberations was a solemn protest against any union of Transylvania with Hungary, without the consent of the Roumanic nation. The Hungarian ministry kept on, and had recourse to rigorous measures. Everywhere they forbade the formation of the Roumanic national guard, everywhere the *men of intelligence* were imprisoned, and some who had been thus named in derision were hanged. Then a second meeting, after the fashion of the former Moldo-Wallachian convocation was held at

Balásfalva. In May, they had only protested against the union with Hungary; but, in this second popular assembly, the Roumanic nation declared itself separated from this country, recognized the Austrian constitution, took up arms and made common cause with the imperial troops against the Hungarians. Whatever may be the result, the Magyars would do wrong to accuse the Roumani of rebelling against them; if they had pursued a different policy, they would probably have had all this numerous population on their side." — De Bourgoing, as cited in the *N. A. Review*, April, 1850, pp. 507 — 509.

The passages quoted from the speech of Wesselényi, taken in the connection in which they are given in the above extract, would seem to imply that he had censured the conduct of his countrymen towards the Wallachs, and had counselled a more equitable course. They would, therefore, appear to contain an indirect admission, on the part of one of the Hungarian patriots themselves, that their own errors had been the cause of the distracted state of the country. Such a piece of evidence must have great weight in the mind of every candid reader. The date, too, ascribed to the speech of Wesselényi, — the 29th of May, — and the rejection by the diet, at that early period, before serious disturbances had taken place in Transylvania, of conciliatory measures proposed by one of the most distinguished patriots in the country, would seem to point out the Magyars as aggressors.

The speech of Wesselényi, from which De Bourgoing quotes, was delivered in August,* nearly three months after the union with Hungary had been accepted by the diet of Transylvania. The disturbances fomented by Austrian emissaries and designing demagogues had already assumed a serious aspect. Wesselényi begins his speech with a sketch of the unhappy condition of the country. He uses the comparison attributed to him by De Bourgoing. "With the eyes of my spirit," he says, "I penetrate the cloud-covered future of my country. The night that lies upon it is darker than the night of my eyes." He considers the various means by which rescue from the dangers which threaten the country,

* Frey, *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte*. Mannheim, 1849. — Levitschnigg, *Kossuth und seine Bannerschaft*. Pesth, 1850.

through the unhappy dissensions which distract it, may be sought. He declares that the only means to be employed is conciliation; but he is very far from reproaching his countrymen with having acted in a different spirit from that which he recommends. De Bourgoing extracts a passage from the beginning and another from the end of the speech, and from the manner in which he words the proposal made by Wesselényi, it would be inferred that the Hungarian patriot had desired his countrymen to recognize the distinct nationality of the Wallachs.

It will be observed that, in stating the demands of the Wallachs or Rumani, De Bourgoing says, that they asked "only the recognition of their nationality, and the freedom that had been promised without distinction to all the races inhabiting the kingdom." A reader not familiar with the questions at issue in Hungary might, finding these two demands thus classed together, and introduced with "only," infer that they were of equal justice, and that they were both refused by the Hungarian diet. The claim to be admitted to the freedom which the Hungarian constitution bestowed on all the inhabitants of Hungary, is one of manifest justice. From the period of the union of Transylvania with Hungary, the inhabitants of the former country had a right to an equal share in the privileges of the Hungarian constitution. Their claims in this respect were fully recognized. That any misapprehension on this subject could exist among the Wallachs is only to be accounted for by their extreme ignorance, which left them at the mercy of the emissaries of despotism and unprincipled agitators. The demand for the "recognition of nationality" is of quite another character. By the union with Hungary, the distinction of nationalities which had previously existed in Transylvania was abolished. The Hungarian constitution recognized only Hungarian citizens. All the inhabitants of the country, under this title, enjoyed equal rights, without reference to race. It is manifest that the demand for the recognition of the distinct nationality of one of the races inhabiting the country could not be granted, without a great and injurious change in the constitution. Such concessions as could be safely made were made by the Hungarian diet.

“There is one right,” says Wesselényi, in the speech from which De Bourgoing quotes, “which, in a country inhabited by many nationalities, can only be possessed by one. The official language must be the language of the race which has given its name to the country, the language which the oath of the prince has confirmed as the diplomatic language. This right cannot be shared; for, to decide its partition, the sword must be thrown into the scale. Every other right must be possessed by all in common. We have hitherto acted righteously in this respect. We have divested ourselves of our own privileges, to bestow privileges upon those who were deprived of them. The privileged Hungarian legislature has made every right common to the German, the Slavonian, the Wallach. Not because this or that man is a Hungarian, but because he is a man and a citizen, does he enjoy these rights. But the people have been deceived; they have been made to believe that the benefits which have been conferred upon them have proceeded only from the hand of the emperor. We have bestowed all our exertions to raise the millions to the rank of citizens, but the millions have been estranged from us; we have but weakened ourselves. The intriguing seducers of the people have persuaded the Croats and Serbs, the Saxons and Wallachs, that we wish to encroach upon their language. Otherwise these populations have had no cause either for apprehension or complaint. The rights of the Saxons were based upon privileges; they were secured by no law, no constitution. The new system has founded the rights and privileges of all the populations upon the constitution. No former law secured their nationality to the Wallachs, and now no separate nationalities can receive constitutions.”

He speaks of the real grievances from which the Wallachs had formerly suffered.

“It is true that the rod of arbitrary power was wielded over the Wallach; yet not because he was a Wallach; the condition of the Magyar peasant was not better. This appears clearly from the fact, that the Wallach noble was raised to the highest offices. There was also the persecution of those professing the old Greek faith, which was carried so far that many died without baptism, and lived in unconsecrated marriage.* This has ceased; for in regard to their religious faith they are now as free as the Hungarians.”

* The reader will find an account of the oppression exercised by the Austrian government over the Wallachs of Transylvania, belonging to the old Greek Church, in Paget's *Hungary and Transylvania*, Vol. II. pp. 128, 129 (English edition, 1850).

The motion which Wesselényi proposed was, that the house should offer to the Wallachs or Rumani, and to all the nationalities, the assurance of its intention to protect them in the possession of all their rights and civil liberties, and that the Wallachs should be allowed the use, in official matters, of the Wallachian language together with the Hungarian. The motion was accepted by the diet.*

We cannot but be of opinion, that, apart from the use made of the name of Wesselényi, the account given by De Bourgoing of the origin of the insurrection in Transylvania contains inconsistencies which might arrest the attention even of a careless reader. For example, the motion of Wesselényi is said by De Bourgoing to have been made and rejected on the 29th of May. "*The most odious acts soon followed.*" Among these acts are recounted the union of Transylvania with Hungary without the consent of the Rumani, the sending commissioners with orders to exterminate the men of capacity, and so on. "The Roumani," our author continues, "*driven to extremities, assembled, in the month of May, to the number of sixty thousand,*" &c. It is, of course, to be understood, that the Rumani were "driven to extremities" by the "odious acts" which followed the rejection of Wesselényi's conciliatory proposal of the 29th of May. If, therefore, we suppose the meeting which was held at Balásfalva in May to have taken place on the very last day of that month, but one intermediate day is allowed for the accomplishment of the union, the erection of gibbets on the highways, the placing inscriptions upon the public edifices in every part of Transylvania, and the sending forth of commissioners for the extermination of the men of capacity. It is further to be observed, that the diet to which Wesselényi offered his conciliatory motion is, by M. de Bourgoing, stated to have been held at Pest. The first diet held at Pest was opened on the 5th of July. Nor is this all. The Hungarian diet was not in session during the month of May. It was, therefore, an impossibility that it should have heard and rejected the proposal of Wesselényi in

* Frey, *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte.* Mannheim, 1849.

that month. The meeting at Balásfalva was held on the 15th of May; consequently, fourteen days before the date assigned by De Bourgoing to the motion of Wes-selényi, the rejection of which was, according to that writer, the first of the series of unjust acts which caused the Wallachs to assemble in this meeting to protest against the union. We give an account of this meeting, from Schütte's *Ungarn*.

"The Wallachs, also, seemed, at first, not averse to the union. By the exertions of their popes and procurators, and some Hungarian patriots, a great popular meeting was called together at Balásfalva; and, on the 15th of May, twelve thousand horsemen appeared on the plains of Balásfalva, — perhaps the most remarkable assembly which Europe has seen. Wallachian procurators in their advocate's dress, protopopes with their high-pointed caps and long beards, Boyars in their Oriental costume, Hungarian jurates, Magnates in their fanciful dresses, and the Székely chiefs, harangued the stormy crowds from the different stages. The result of the day was, that the Wallachs were acknowledged as the fourth politically privileged nation; civil, religious, political emancipation, freedom of the press, &c., were assured to them, and they therefore declared themselves for the union." *

The Wallachs were, accordingly, represented at the next Transylvanian diet, by which the union with Hungary was decreed. The following account of the proceedings in this diet are taken from Szilágyi's History of the Hungarian Revolution. †

"The diet assembled on the 28th of May. The royal commissary was Baron Puchner, commander-in-chief of the army in Transylvania. The details of the second sitting, in which the union was proclaimed, are, on many accounts, worthy of being related.

"It was ten o'clock in the morning. Noise, movement, excitement everywhere, showed what an important day was in prospect. The throng collected in the street spoke of the expected opposition of the deputies from Hermanstadt. Many feared some dangerous outbreak. All the benches were taken early in the

* *Ungarn und der Ungarische Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, von Dr. A. Schütte, I. 231.

† This is a Hungarian work published in Pest in 1850, during the administration of Haynau. It is anti-national in spirit, but is very valuable on account of the documents it contains in the original Hungarian, and also because it gives many details not to be found elsewhere.

morning, and a dense crowd filled the hall and the street without. The hall presented a striking spectacle. Plumes, banners, waved from the galleries. An expression of intense expectation sat on every face. On the right of the hall was erected a stage for ladies, but part of this too was occupied by men.

“On the left of the throne were the benches of the royal officers. Not one of the heroes of the diet of 1847 was to be seen here. In their place, a deputation from Pest, who represented the sympathizers in Hungary, occupied a corner. On the benches of the deputies at the right sat the popular men of Transylvania; opposite to the throne, the taxal and Saxon deputies. In the centre, a table surrounded by the regalists, and, finally, the seat of the president. At the doors stood members of the national guard, for the crowd outside pressed in. The walls were decorated with the arms of Hungary and with inscriptions,—‘Long live the king, the Palatine, the Hungarian ministry,’ &c. After ten o’clock, the members of the diet began to assemble. The hall received its old favorites with thundering *éljens*. When Wesselényi entered, it seemed as if the acclamations would never have an end. The same thing happened at the entrance of Lemény.

“The hall is full; there is not a place for another foot. The shout, *Éljen az unió!* Live the union! resounds from the street.

“The president opened the meeting. Baron Wesselényi then declared, in a short and pithy speech, that the only thing for Transylvania, under the present circumstances, was the union.

“Then Charles Szász rose, and asked a declaration from the President. Dominic Kemény calls upon those who have any objections to speak. All eyes turn on the Saxon deputies. There is silence as of the grave, and intense expectation. The Kronstadt deputy rises and speaks thus:—‘In the name of my constituents, I give my vote for the union, with the maintenance of the integrity of the Pragmatic Sanction.’

“Amid tremendous acclamations, the Saxon deputies rose and bowed to the assembly, which was transported with joy. Dionysius Kemény spoke at length of the objects of the union, of the advantages which might be expected from it, and expressed his belief that it was the only remedy for the disturbed state of the people. In a part of his speech he referred to the Saxons and Wallachs. Upon that, Schmidt, the deputy from Hermanstadt, declared the groundlessness of all those calumnies which had been circulated concerning the Saxons. (Approbation.) ‘It was reported among them, too, that here the life of a Saxon would not be safe. I did not believe it, and the best proof is, that here I am.’ The people without called for Schmidt and Lemény, who went out to them. The Saxon deputy [Schmidt]

greeted the Magyar people in the name of the Saxon nation, and related what had just taken place in the hall. They brought a chair to Bishop Lemény, and the venerable old man, standing on it, spoke in a moving manner. He reciprocated with grateful greeting the respect paid to the Wallach nation in his person. He urged the assembled crowd to concord, to attachment to their king and country, and promised the same in the name of the Wallach nation. The people, with loud shouts of 'Long live the Wallachs!' 'Long live the Saxons!' led them back to the hall. After some more speeches, the president declared that the union had been accepted by general consent." — Szilágyi, *A' Magyar Ferradalom Története*, 70, 71.

It was not without a feeling of surprise that we found the name of John Paget in the list of the witnesses against Hungary brought forward by the North American Reviewer. Mr. Paget is the author of a valuable work, entitled "Hungary and Transylvania," published about eleven years ago. His motive for writing, as explained in his preface, was the same with that which influenced M. de Gerando, — the desire to call the attention of his countrymen to an interesting people, whose institutions and character, in consequence of the circumstances of their position, were very little understood in foreign countries.

The Reviewer has given, in "The Politics of Europe," two sets of extracts from the work of Mr. Paget. The first consists of some anecdotes illustrative of the strong national feeling of the Magyars. National pride is, without doubt, a striking trait in the character of that people; and this feeling will, doubtless, in Hungary, as in other countries, especially among the uneducated classes, sometimes display itself in an unreasonable manner. But national pride is not in itself a reprehensible trait. When based upon worthy grounds, it affords the same security in regard to the conduct of a nation, which a high sense of personal character gives in the case of an individual.

"All the cruelties of a Haynau," says Schütte, "could not bring the Hungarians to make reprisals upon the numerous prisoners that were in their hands. Even in the midst of the rage of battle, this generous trait in the Magyar character displayed itself towards their wounded and fallen enemies."

"National feeling has no little influence on this feature of the

Magyar character, for everywhere this motive is in the background: — ‘Thus acts the Magyar!’ An Austrian officer died after the battle of Gödöllő in the arms of a Honvéd, and, in dying, gave into his hands the only thing of value he had with him, a watch, which he requested him to send to a lady in Vienna. The poor Honvéd answered nothing but *Magyar ember*, (I am a Magyar,) made his way through the outposts of the enemy, and delivered the watch into the charge of an Austrian officer. When it was suggested to Kossuth, that, in the worst event, he might make Austrian bank notes, as he had all the means for it in his power, and that he need only give them out in case Austria would not acknowledge the Hungarian notes, he rejected the proposal with a simple *Magyar ember*. We could bring forward a hundred such examples from the late war, and are of opinion that this noble, but sometimes overstrained, self-respect has not a little contributed to the downfall of Hungary; for, in a contest with brute force, generosity is often dangerous.” — *Ungarn und der Ungarische Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, I. 63, 64.

This innate self-respect, which deters from what is ungenerous or unworthy, is a trait in the Magyar character which cannot be overlooked, even by their opponents. “The Magyar people,” says Desprez, “have preserved in their character a gravity and elevation which would have rendered vulgarity of sentiment or expression odious to them; Kossuth has never spoken to them any other language than that of poetry, honor, courage, national dignity.”*

The second set of extracts from Mr. Paget’s work consists of a number of detached passages, brought forward to support the Reviewer’s assertions in regard to the harsh manner in which the feudal rights of the nobles were exercised.† It is to be observed, that, out of the six

* *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Déc., 1849.

† From some passages in “The War of Races,” it would seem that the writer of that article supposed that the peasants of Magyar race enjoyed superior privileges to the rest of the peasantry. He says: —

“The Magyars who are not noble form the higher class of the peasantry; and, though not often rich, they have generally most of the necessaries and even the comforts of life; as the feudal burdens on their lands are not excessive, and their tenant rights are often very valuable.” — *North American Review*, January, 1850, p. 88.

The burdens of the Magyar peasant were not lighter, nor his tenant rights more valuable, than those of the peasants of the other races. The laws made no distinctions between the different races. (We use the past tense, because in March, 1848, the urban system was abolished, and the peasants by the act of the diet — composed of landed proprietors — were

passages selected by the Reviewer with this object, four relate, not to Hungary, but to Transylvania, where reform had made much less progress, and where the distinction between "sovereign nations" and "subject nations," which the Reviewer supposes to have existed in Hungary, really existed, prior to the union of the two countries, in 1848. Even in Transylvania, however, great improvements in the condition of the peasantry were effected during the ten years preceding the Hungarian war. This improvement was due to the Magyar magnates and nobles.*

"We do not believe," says De Gerando, "that there is found, in the history of political parties, one more worthy of interest and sympathy than that which the liberal nobility of Transylvania compose. This party sincerely desires reform; it has already realized some of the most important. And for whose benefit? For that of a suffering class whom long servitude has formed to hatred, and who may one day imitate the example of their neighbours in Galicia. Who prevents this nobility from repairing a part of which it is innocent, and from introducing justice into the legislation? The government, which ought to take in hand the cause of the oppressed. And yet is it not upon the nobles that the popular vengeance will fall, if the breaking of this yoke, which is maintained in spite of themselves, is delayed? When will the Austrian policy cease to paralyze the most noble efforts? Holy justice, how long shall this heavy hand weigh on a whole people!" — *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, p. 227.

Of the two extracts of this series which relate to Hungary, the first has reference to a law formerly existing, which gave the manorial lord the right of ordering the infliction of corporal punishment on his peasants, to the

made owners of the lands which they occupied.) If the Magyars are regarded as forming "the higher class of the peasantry," it is not to their greater wealth that they owe this distinction. The German peasants of Hungary have, in this respect, from their great industry and frugality, a decided superiority over all the other races. (See Fényes, *Magyarország Leirása*.) De Langsdorff, — one of the Reviewer's authorities, — in an article in which he treats of the condition of the Hungarian peasantry, dwells much upon the superior prosperity of those of the German race. "The burdens of the German peasant," he says, "are precisely those which are borne by all the peasants. If, then, there is not found among the other races that enviable comfort which the German villages display, it is to the vices, or, if you will, to the qualities of race, that it is to be attributed, not to the urbanial legislation." — *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Décembre, 1848.

* See De Gerando, *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, pp. 222 — 227.

amount of twenty-five blows. Mr. Paget speaks of this law as already repealed.

The other extract relating to the Hungarian peasantry refers to the *cassa domestica*, or the taxes raised for the expenses of the county, which were formerly borne by the peasants alone. The Reviewer has himself informed us in his article on "The War of Races," — when he designed to show the injustice of bestowing the land on the peasants without indemnification to the owners, — "that the aggregate of all these burdens does not amount to a fair rent for the value of the land" (p. 95). But whether this system was an oppressive one to the peasants, or not, it was numbered among past things before the breaking out of the war.

Mr. Paget expresses with frankness and decision his opinion of whatever appeared to him objectionable in the institutions of Hungary; but there is nothing in his work which will justify the inference that the rights of the nobles over the peasants were exorbitant, or harshly used. After giving an account of the laws which regulate the rights and obligations of the peasants, he adds: —

"I have entered thus at length into the laws affecting the Hungarian peasantry, especially those which regulate their intercourse with their lords, because I have been anxious to show that they are not, as strangers commonly suppose, serfs, nor their lords tyrants, with unlimited powers over their lives and fortunes.

"The rights of each are accurately defined, and a cheap and easy process exists for obtaining justice on either side. The rent paid by the peasant in labor and produce, instead of cash, is exceedingly small; and he is endowed with a right in the property inconsistent even with our notions of the landlord's just claims." — *Hungary and Transylvania*, Vol. I. p. 305.

It is to be remembered, in reading Mr. Paget's work, that it is more than twelve years since he was in Hungary, and that many reforms took place there subsequent to his visit, even before the changes which were effected in March, 1848.

The Reviewer begins his last article upon Hungary with about thirty pages of extracts, culled from various sources, leaving it to the discrimination of his readers to make such application of them as they will, or can. It is, of course, understood that all these passages contain

something which, if rightly interpreted, would prove to be very discreditable to the Hungarians, either as regards their earlier or more recent history; but many of them will, we believe, in this view, even with all the aid which the Italics of the Reviewer offer to the imagination, be found to baffle the penetration of the most acute reader. Many of them, indeed, — especially those taken from respectable authorities, — must be quite unintelligible, except to those readers who are familiar with the books from which they are taken, and whose memory can supply the context. With such readers, they will entirely fail of the effect intended. Having thus placed before his readers what he calls “a formidable array of authorities,” the Reviewer informs them that he has told the story of the war in Hungary over again, “merely using the language of a crowd of reputable and unimpeached witnesses, instead of” his “own.”

The first of these unimpeached witnesses is Lamartine, whom the North American Reviewer has elsewhere characterized as a “fantastic rhetorician, wholly devoid of practical talent” (see *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXIX. p. 282), who “established himself at the head of affairs by virtue of a theatrical manner and a few high-sounding speeches” (p. 283), and, finally, “our poor, phrase-making, gasconading friend Lamartine” (p. 284). With what conscience does the Reviewer bring forward the opinions of such a person as evidence on an important historical question? If the North American Reviewer does not believe that Lamartine (see *N. A. Review*, Vol. LXIX. p. 312) is capable of judging of the character of the French revolution, what reason has he to suppose that he is better qualified to pronounce on that of the Hungarians?

The next witness is Lord Brougham, who is summoned, possibly, to confirm the North American Reviewer's statements in regard to the “credit” due to the Austrian government for its zeal in the promotion of reform. Lord Brougham ascribes the measures of reform affecting the condition of the peasantry which were accomplished in Hungary between 1832 and 1836, or, as he says, “the new urbarium of 1835,” to an “edict” of “that eminent statesman, so long at the head of the

Austrian councils," — Prince Metternich! If this be correct, what becomes of the account given, after De Langsdorff, in "The War of Races" (p. 107), of the reforms passed by the Hungarian diet?

It is not, however, necessary to resort to any secondary authority to show that the "new urbarium" was passed by the votes of the Hungarian diet. We have before us the volume containing the acts of the Hungarian diet of 1832–36, published at Pressburg in Hungarian and Latin. Among these are the urbarial laws, and all the laws past for the improvement of the condition of the peasantry during that period, being Articles IV. to XIII. inclusive, of those acts.* These laws are signed by the king, and by the Hungarian Chancellor Reviczky. The king, in promulgating these laws, says that the lords prelates, barons, magnates, nobles, and other states and orders of the kingdom of Hungary, and the parts thereto annexed, have laid before his Majesty these articles, which have been concluded in the diet by their common votes and suffrages, praying that he would benignly deign to accept, approve, and confirm the same, &c.

One of the most important of the Reviewer's authorities, one which has furnished him with not less than a dozen of his citations, is a little pamphlet, published in London, under the name of Corvinus. It is a production of no value whatever, and not worth noticing. Such as it is, however, its testimony in regard to the objects of the Hungarian revolution is in direct contradiction to the assertions of the North American Reviewer. For example, in speaking of the diet of 1847–48, he says, —

"But a spirit came over that diet which no administrative reforms could satisfy, — a spirit totally at variance with the genius of the ancient constitution, — which established its ascendancy by abrogating that constitution, and sought to maintain it by sacrificing the monarchy. There can be no greater error than to suppose that the war of 1848–49 was a movement in defence of the time-honored institutions which had their roots in the laws of St. Stephen and Andreas the Second." — *Hungary, &c.*, by Corvinus, p. 9.

* See 183 $\frac{1}{2}$ *dik Évi Országgyűlésen alkotott Törvény Czikkeleyek. (Articuli Comitiorum Anni 183 $\frac{1}{2}$.)* Po'sonyban.

How does this coincide with the statements in (pp. 120, 130, 135) the North American Review for January, 1850, that the Magyars engaged in a war for the support of their ancient feudal institutions ?

We believe that the readers of the North American must be vividly impressed with the difficulty of obtaining available evidence against the Hungarians, when they find the Reviewer offering them the opinions of an anonymous correspondent of an unknown newspaper, quoted in an anonymous work.* The Reviewer is indebted, for this important contribution to the number of his authorities, to a work entitled *Thronfolge und der Pragmatische Sanction in Ungarn*, published in Pressburg in 1849. This work does not appear to be of a very original character, if we may judge from the two extracts given from it in the North American Review. One of these belongs to this nameless newspaper correspondent, the other is the property of M. Desprez, being taken from an article by that writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of the 15th of August, 1848 (pp. 620, 621). These articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* are an inexhaustible mine for the enemies of Hungary on both sides of the Atlantic. They, of course, furnish their contributions to the North American Review for January, 1851. Desprez thus does double duty there, appear-

* See the extract on pp. 232, 233, of the North American Review for January, 1851, beginning, "A newspaper correspondent was right who," &c. This is not the only occasion on which the North American Reviewer has relied upon testimony of this nature. The statements of an "English officer," introduced on p. 132 of the North American Review for January, 1850, to substantiate the Reviewer's assertions in regard to the cruelties perpetrated by Bem's army in Transylvania, rest on the authority of the anonymous correspondent of a newspaper. Some passages from a letter, purporting to be from an "English officer," communicated to the London Times, are quoted in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for August, 1849 (p. 226), by De Langsdorff, who, however, names his authority. A portion of the extracts given from this letter by De Langsdorff are translated back into English by the North American Reviewer, and appear before the American public as valid testimony. This is an example of the manner in which injurious tales against the Hungarians and their leaders are propagated. (The letter in question may be found in the London Evening Mail, 9th and 11th of April, 1849.) It is not a little remarkable, that the North American Reviewer should manifest such respect for the opinions and statements of anonymous correspondents of European journals, while he treats in the most contumelious manner the writings of men of established reputation in the newspapers of his own country.

ing once in his own person, and figuring as a separate authority in *Thronfolge*.

It could be wished that the articles of the North American Reviewer afforded no stronger examples of the difficulty of obtaining valid testimony against the Hungarians, than is found in his thus elevating into authorities anonymous correspondents of newspapers, and writers for French Reviews of articles whose inconsistencies with themselves and with each other should alone, it would seem, have indicated the necessity of having recourse to some more authentic sources of information. But a more striking illustration of this fact is found in the mode in which he has been forced to make his citations from the more respectable works which he has classed among his authorities. It is not our intention to enlarge upon this topic. The work of Mr. Paget has been republished in this country, and those of our readers who feel an interest in the affairs of Hungary will doubtless determine for themselves whether the pages of this writer convey the unfavorable impression of the Hungarians, which might be inferred from the partial quotations given in the North American Review.

One of the works, however, from which citations are made in the last number of that Review, seems to demand a more extended notice. This is the work by Max Schlesinger, published in Berlin, early in the last year, under the title *Aus Ungarn*. This title is more indicative of the character of the work, than that which has been given to it in the English translation, — “The War in Hungary.” It is a collection of sketches, written in a spirited style, and conveying a great deal of interesting information. It is not, however, a work from which one, previously ignorant of the events of the war, and those immediately antecedent to it, could obtain an accurate knowledge of them. The writer takes for granted a certain degree of information on these subjects, on the part of the reader. It is not a history of the war, nor is it written with strict historical accuracy. Mr. Pulszky has furnished an introduction to the English translation of this work, together with notes, in which he has corrected the most important of the occasional inaccuracies into which the author has fallen.

We have not space to examine all the extracts which the *North American Reviewer* has given from the work of Schlesinger, or to supply the context of all those which are unintelligible as they stand in the pages of his *Review*. We will take the first extract there given from this work, as an example from which the reader may judge how faithfully most of the other citations express the opinions of the writer from whose pages they are drawn. This first extract is on page 212 of the *North American Review* for January, 1851. It is from that portion of Schlesinger's work in which he speaks of the character of the Hungarian revolution.

“The Magyar movement is widely distinguished, both by the power which called it forth and the object it had in view, from all the revolutions that convulsed Europe during the last two years. The political knowledge of the Magyars does not extend much beyond that of their own constitution; and it is remarkable with what singular affection and constancy this ancient constitution, with all its defects and abnormities, has been held fast and cherished by the people. Whilst all the other nations have sought to enlarge more or less their representative constitutions, the Magyar has dreaded any change in his, clinging to its very letter, as the Mussulman to the words of the Koran.”

Thus far quotes the *North American Reviewer*. Schlesinger proceeds as follows:—

“The cause of this lies not so much in a belief in its excellence, as in the long struggles of the constitutional principle against the absolutist efforts of the Vienna cabinet, to oppose which the Magyars in their diet at Pressburg had no more effective weapon than the letter of their constitution, ratified as it has been by the coronation oath of every successive king. In this policy the opposite parties in the diet were agreed; indeed, for a long time past, it had been the safest, nay, the only possible course. The liberal Hungarian did not cling to his ancient constitution, as the free citizen of the United States does to his, from a conviction of its excellence, but because he knew that the concession of any single point would strengthen the absolutist government in Vienna. With this feeling the Left party at Pressburg, advocated and held up to view the articles of the constitution long enough to endear them to the less clear-sighted mass of the people.

“The extension of the constitution upon its legitimate basis appeared to the liberal party to be unadvisable until the absolutist principle was crushed by the March revolution. This extension

was sought and carried out by the abrogation of old abuses, by the introduction of laws adapted to the times, and by the creation of an independent and responsible ministry. That this last measure entailed a breach with Austria was known to those men who strove to accomplish it; yet they were short-sighted enough to believe that such a rupture might consist with the union of the two countries in the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine.

“The ancient constitution, which, in accordance with strict legal form, had undergone material alterations, with the consent of the majority of the national representatives and the sanction of the king, remained the basis of the last revolution. Austria declared herself not bound by the Hungarian constitution, on the ground that it had been fundamentally modified; forgetting or denying that the very essence of that constitution provided for its gradual and independent progression, with the consent of the majority in the chambers and the crown. By the renunciation of this principle, Austria, from the very first, destroyed the possibility of effecting any good understanding with the Magyars, and the latter had no longer a ground upon which to resist the centralizing policy of Austria.”—*War in Hungary*, Vol. I. pp. 114–117.

Another extract from Schlesinger which calls for comment is that given on pp. 234, 235 of the *North American Review* for January, 1851, relating to the proceedings in the diet held at Szegedin (July, 1849). This is one of the passages in Schlesinger to which the editor, Mr. Pulszky, has appended a note, stating that it is *incorrect*. The *North American Reviewer* quotes the passage, but omits the note. Schlesinger appears from this, and some other passages, to labor under some misapprehension respecting the conduct of the Hungarian government in regard to the insurgent Servians and Wallachs, and to suppose that they had not adopted every means in their power to effect a pacification. In place of all other comment upon this subject, we will give an extract from the speech of the prime minister, Szemere, delivered on the 21st of July, 1849, at the opening of the diet held at Szegedin.

“The next wish of the nation is the pacification of the races who have been incited to insurrection. Terrible is the misery of the Wallachs and Servians, who have exiled themselves from their own homes, but yet more terrible are the cruelties which they have exercised upon the Magyars and Germans. The blindness of these people, which permits them to be excited to rebellion by the intrigues of the dynasty which oppresses them, is incon-

ceivable. But yet more inconceivable is the unprincipled heartlessness of their leaders, who in various ways, if not indeed directly, are wasting the strength of the people in the service of that very dynasty with whom all the sufferings of the people originate. What have not the people, the Wallach, the Servian, and the Magyar people, suffered in this beautiful country? Every thing, every thing; all the sufferings of servitude. When and how long did they suffer? Since the memory of man, until 1848. Who governed, who ruled, in Hungary until 1848? The Vienna cabinet, the Austrian ministry. It was this government which held the agricultural population under the yoke, so that neither their thoughts nor their property were their own. It was this government which made the Wallachs the servants of their lords. It was this government which prohibited the meeting of the synod of the old Greek Church. It was this government which deprived the Servian people of their ancient rights in regard to their liberty in ecclesiastical matters. This government subjected the Wallachs to the Servian clergy. It was this government which bound the inhabitants of the military frontier to the soil. Finally, it was this Austrian government which kept these races in a state of constant irritation against each other, so that those who lived on the same soil, under the same sky, drew into their souls, with God's air, only mutual hatred. The executive power returned into the hands of the nation only in 1848. And how did the Hungarians use this power? They abolished the tithes and *robot*. They proclaimed equality of rights and obligations, without distinction of race or religion. They convoked the synod of the Greek Church, and appointed for the management of its affairs a separate section in the appropriate department of the ministry. They liberated the inhabitants of the frontier from their servitude, and thus the great masses of Wallachs and Servians living there not only obtained the right to elect representatives to the diet, — a right before attached, not to race, but to nobility, — but were also freed from their military bondage; so that they were placed on an equal footing with the other inhabitants of the country, while their material prosperity was, at the same time, secured by important concessions.

“It was thus that the Hungarian government entered upon the exercise of its power. The foundation of fraternity, of equality and freedom, without distinction of language or religion, was laid; nothing remained but to adapt these three sacred principles in detail. It was then that the intrigues of the soulless dynasty — which had concealed from the people the gift of freedom that had been bestowed upon them — caused this misguided people to break out into insurrection, at the very moment when they ought to have been celebrating the festival of their liberation.

“Gentlemen, you know all this well. I do not therefore enter into details. But it was needful for me to say thus much, for the misguided people are ignorant of all this,—that people who were good, quiet, and patient in their servitude, and now, infatuated, are shedding their blood in the contest against freedom. Europe does not know this. Europe sees in the rebellion of the Wallachs and Servians a proof, not that the Hungarian government has bestowed freedom on all the inhabitants of the country without distinction, but a proof that it designs to keep them in servitude. And this is one of the principal reasons why the government regards it as its chief aim to pacify the people at any price, so that it can be done consistently with justice. I remember with grief the many thousand Magyars and Germans who have fallen victims to the fury of these people. But I feel pity for the murderers of those victims also; for a deceived, infatuated people, even in their sin, merit not condemnation only, but compassion. Had the Hungarian government, in the beginning, answered cruelty with cruelty, there would perhaps have been peace, if only the peace of the grave. But this was not done. Every means of moral influence was put in use, to bind once more the bonds of brotherhood. Explanations, proclamations, were distributed by hundreds of thousands. We used every honorable means that the press afforded. We supported the representatives in their efforts for pacification, and we aided those who have become victims of the persecutions of their own kindred, in consequence of these efforts. We knew that the leaders of the Moldavian movement exercised great influence over the Wallachs, and we tried to neutralize this influence. We knew also that the Servian rebellion was nourished from Servia; and we did not delay to communicate to the Servian prince and his government our views in regard to the rights of the different races in Hungary. These views were received with full approbation. We did not delay a moment in our work of pacification, or in presenting our principles in detail. And what was the result? This;—when we were victorious, our views were satisfactory; but when the star of our fortune began to be clouded, we were answered with evasion and postponement. In a word, the most upright, the most honorable conduct upon our part, met only with deceit and treachery. Our object in this has been no other than, on the one hand, to hasten the security of the independence of the country, and of civil liberty; on the other, to restore the reign of mild humanity, so that the chief glory of our revolution, a mild and peaceful development, might be kept unpolled by the bloody footprints of terrorism. Our conditions were so framed that we could not grant more without sacrificing the unity of the state, and less we did not think sufficient. They were so framed that, certainly,

no country ever gave such rights to the smaller nationalities dwelling within its boundaries. We expressed every thing in clear language, with precision, abstaining entirely from those false promises with which Austria is accustomed to deceive the people,—Austria, which promised the Servians a *Woiwodina*, but which gave them only the name;— which promised freedom to the inhabitants of the frontier, who, however, are still *serfs*, *glebe* bound, and forced to send their ten or twenty thousand men to serve in foreign wars;—Austria, which proclaimed equality of rights for all nationalities; yet the Servians, Wallachs, Galicians, and Croats are obliged to use the German language as soon as they pass their own thresholds;— which promised to the Bukowina, that, though it be only a small territory, the vernacular language should be introduced into the schools, and then explained this promise to mean, that all instruction should be given in the German language, but that it should be permitted, at the same time, to teach the rules of the vernacular tongue.

These efforts for the pacification of the insurgent populations, we judged to be suitable and just. Hitherto they have remained without effect; but we hope that they may yet become effectual. We are responsible to you in this world, and, beyond this world, to God; and we have wished so to conduct this government, that the All-powerful, who holds the fate of nations in his hand, may say of the Hungarians, This nation deserves to be free, for it knew how to be just to other nations, to whom it has given land from its own land, rights bought with its own blood, and to whom, even after they had carried slaughter and devastation through the land, it was still generous enough to extend the olive-branch of peace with brotherly hand.”*

The work of Schlesinger, notwithstanding some occasional inaccuracies, is a very valuable contribution to the history of the Hungarian struggle. It is of so interesting and popular a character, that it will, undoubtedly, soon be republished in this country. It is the less necessary, therefore, to make many extracts from it. But since we have not space to comment upon all the citations made from it in the *North American Review*, we will give a few passages, illustrative of the author's views on some points, in regard to which they might be misapprehended, if judged of only by the extracts there offered. Schlesinger thus explains the motives which induced Jellachich to reject all the conciliatory proposals of the Hungarian ministry:—

* *A' Magyar Forradalom Fértsai*, Szilágyi Sándortól. Pesten, 1850.
VOL. L.—4TH S. VOL. XV. NO. II.

“The Prince [Esterházy, member of the Hungarian ministry] had several conferences with Jellachich. The ministry at Pesth declared that they desired nothing more than a peaceful settlement of affairs, and that the Croats had only to come forward in a constitutional manner in the National Assembly, where they enjoyed equal rights, and all their reasonable desires would be satisfied.

“But how could such proposals obtain a hearing, while Jellachich was at the same time secretly receiving the promise of Austrian support, — a promise which led him to expect an easier attainment of his purposes than in the Hungarian Diet, where, at most, he could obtain only partial concessions from the majority of the Magyars ?

“True, indeed, that, among the thirteen millions represented at Pesth, only five millions were Magyars ; and the statician may ask with surprise, why the Slaves had recourse to arms, when they were sure of a victory in Parliament. Jellachich and the court knew very well that such statistical reasoning was fallacious, since the Slovacks and a great portion of the Wallachs and Croats, with all the Germans of the country, were in the Magyar interest.” — *War in Hungary*, Vol. I. pp. 30, 31.

Schlesinger exposes, in a few words, the absurdity of the supposition, that what is called the Slavonic movement in Hungary was a general one among the Hungarians of that race, and that the Magyars stood alone in the contest against Austria.

“The war has proved this truth [“that the Slavish movement did not originate with a majority of the inhabitants of the country”] to demonstration. Slaves fought by thousands in the ranks of the Hungarians, but no Magyars in the Slavish army. The Serbs, Wallachs, Slovacks, Croats, Slavonians, Illyrians, and the Hungarian Ruthenes, notwithstanding all their boasted majority, were unable to obtain the upper hand. Austria even, with all her resources, succumbed ; and the mightiest monarch in the world had to be drawn into an alliance, to terminate a war which, according to the protestations of the Austrian ministry, was carried on by ‘a small, rebellious fraction.’

“If the Hungarian revolution was really the struggle of a ‘small fraction,’ for what reason did the *large* fraction avoid the contest in the diet which the former party invited ? How came it that the weaker party were victorious ? On what pretext were the ‘overwhelming masses of loyal subjects’ punished by the loss of their ancient constitution, for the sins of ‘a handful of rebels’ ? Marvellous logic and justice this in Austrian policy !” — *War in Hungary*, Vol. I. pp. 30, 31.

Schlesinger gives too favorable a view, in some respects, of the character of Jellachich, but he is very far from representing him as the champion of freedom, when he invaded Hungary at the head of the imperial forces.

“It has already been observed, that the frontier regiments formed the flower of the army with which the Ban took the field, to detach the provinces of the south from the crown of St. Stephen. He held the command, as Lieutenant Field-Marshal, in the emperor’s name; the majority of his officers were in the Austrian service; the cannon, taken from the magazines of the frontier, were served by imperial artillery-men, and his cavalry consisted of the Banal Hussars. Great exertions were used to raise and equip this army, whose achievements, however, make but a sorry figure in the annals of the war. As for the 30,000 men who roved after the Ban’s army, helter-skelter, most of them dispersed again before they had time to gain any knowledge of the world; those who remained with the army got accoutred by degrees, but were always a rapacious, worthless rabble, ready only to burn and pillage.

“With this army, Jellachich passed the Drave on the 9th of September, and entered upon Hungarian soil. A man of such high cultivation of mind could not be stopped by the formality of a declaration of war, — that absurdity in the law of nations; he came with no avowed intention of detaching Croatia from the crown of Hungary, nor as an invading foe; he announced himself in the capacity of Imperial Lieutenant Field-Marshal, come with the declared purpose of putting down the revolution in Hungary.

“The fact, that up to this time there had been no trace of a revolution in Hungary, was not allowed to suggest any question or difficulty to enlightened minds; if a revolution had not taken place, one must at all hazards be provoked, in order to furnish a pretext at Vienna for interference. This task Jellachich took upon himself, like a well-trained dog, which is taught to set two bears on one another for the amusement of the spectators and the profit of his master.

“If Jellachich imagined that he could win for his nation more liberty by the sword, aided by Austrian diplomacy and cannon, than they had received from the Magyars by the last act of the Diet, he was simply a fool. If, on the other hand, he was aware of the real merits of the question, and that he was leading his countrymen to slaughter, merely to satisfy the longing of the court to obtain absolute possession of Hungary, he was guilty of a heinous crime.” — *War in Hungary*, Vol. I. pp. 55 - 57.

It is not possible to treat with any degree of fulness a subject so extensive as this Hungarian question, within the limits of a review article. We leave still untouched several topics on which we would willingly have offered some comments. It has been our aim to lay before our readers the leading facts of the case, and to offer some explanations in regard to those points which have been made more especially the subject of misrepresentation.

M. L. P.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology.

Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D. In Three Volumes. Boston: Little & Brown. 1849. 8vo. pp. 1094, 1220, 1406.

A New Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology, and Geography, partly based upon the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. By WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D. Revised, with Numerous Corrections

and Additions. By CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. 8vo. pp. 1040.

A Copious and Critical Latin-English Lexicon, founded on the Larger Latin-German Lexicon of DR. WILLIAM FREUND. With Additions and Corrections from the Lexicons of Gesner, Facioliati, Scheller, Georges, &c. By E. A. ANDREWS, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. Royal 8vo. pp. 1664.

THE works whose titles we have transcribed seem, as they stand before us in their huge forms and their scholarly inscriptions, to constitute in themselves a library. And, indeed, what is there so essential in the library of any student or reader, as good dictionaries or lexicons? One thing is certain, that such noble volumes as these, so full, so thorough, and elaborate, render useless a great many books that are retained in libraries by sufferance, because of their occasional but insecure help. In one of the religious papers of this city, a notice of one of these dictionaries is introduced with a thanksgiving to God on account of those patient men to whom he gives ability to make lexicons. How many of the scholar monks of the Middle Ages would have told their beads in grateful prayer a thousand times over, for either of these volumes! We feel that we have a treasure in possessing them, and we cannot but think that even the school-

boys who are just entering upon the study of the humanities will find the weariness of their task relieved because of the facilities for its thorough execution.

The work first named above, though it bears the imprint of our most distinguished book-publishing firm in Boston, is from the London press. By an arrangement made with the English publishers by Messrs. Little & Brown, an edition of Dr. Smith's noble volumes was printed in London for this country, and, what is more, our scholars can purchase the work for half its London price, though its materials are precisely the same as those of the copies circulated in Great Britain. We are glad that so favorable an arrangement for all parties has been made, and we hope that the example will be followed in other cases. The work is a splendid specimen of art, as well as of scholarship, and its cost is less than that of any similar work now to be purchased.

It is a complete compend of classical literature, history, and biography for more than two thousand years. The results of the most laborious investigations and researches, the deciphering of old monuments and inscriptions, the philological inquiries of all the Continental scholars, as well as the collation of the best annotated editions of the classics, have contributed to authenticate the contents of these volumes. Let any reader turn to any title of the more marked men of antiquity, and he will be able to form some idea of the industry whose fruits are before him. Homer, Socrates, Alexander, Demosthenes, Plato, Cicero, are treated with the familiarity of contemporary biographies. The contents comprise all matters of Greek and Roman history down to A. D. 476, and of Byzantine history down to 1453. The ancient Christian writers are included. St. Jerome figures among others who bear his name (Hieronymus),—in some respects no unfit companionship for him. Painters, sculptors, and architects, with their surviving works, find due treatment. In writing of matters which have a controversial aspect in theology or philosophy, the editor has pursued the method of common sense, to the equal disregard of ancient prejudices and modern mysticism. Wood-cuts of ancient coins illustrate the pages. Very elaborate tables of chronology, parallel years and dynasties, are given in the third volume. Of course, no one mind, however stored, would have been competent for this noble undertaking. Dr. Smith has had the assistance of thirty-five scholars, whose initials follow their respective contributions.

A fourth volume, consisting of a "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography," has been published under the same editorial supervision.

After the completion of his great work, Dr. Smith and his brother projected a condensation or abridgment of it, to serve as

a Classical Dictionary for schools. It is this Abridgment which forms the basis of the second work above named, edited by the diligent and pains-taking Dr. Anthon, whose labors as editor of a greatly improved edition of Lempriere's antiquated Dictionary, ten years ago, eminently qualified him for the task. Dr. Anthon affirms that he has added more than fourteen hundred independent articles to Dr. Smith's Abridgment, besides spending an incalculable amount of care and research in correction, in verification, and enlargement. It is only by close comparison and frequent use that we can be prepared to judge of the relative merits of the English and American editions of the Abridgment. We are willing, however, till we have pursued such a comparison, to accord to Dr. Anthon all that he may claim for his labor. School-boys and college students, if they appreciate the toil that has been spent in their behalf, will not fail to thank him for his work. We should infer, from the very full notes which he attaches to his editions of classic authors, that his faults lean to the side of pity and mercy towards tyros.

We have at repeated intervals taken in hand the solid volume edited by Dr. Andrews, and regard it as a work of which we may feel proud as a specimen of the scholarship of the country. What publisher among us, twenty or thirty years ago, would have ventured on an undertaking which the Harpers have now so confidently risked? The Lexicon indicates an era in our academical and collegiate history. Not that we were without a Latin Lexicon of eminent accuracy and value. On the contrary, the compilation from Facciolati and Forcellini, by Messrs. Leverett and Torrey, answered every needful purpose of common use, and is not likely now to be superseded. The introduction of certain philological and philosophical principles in the apparatus of the work is the great novelty of the volume now before us. The basis of it is the large work of Dr. Freund, condensed by a retrenchment of citations, while the peculiar features of the original are all retained. All other Lexicons are content to name the authors who use a word; Dr. Freund refers us to the very place in each author whom he cites. In the author's original Preface, which is translated by President Woolsey of Yale College, we have the philosophical principles on which the work is constructed, and which are mechanically illustrated in its typography. Words are regarded as embracing, under their original, their acquired, and their metaphorical significations, the following elements:—Grammatical, Etymological, Exegetical, Synonymous, Historical, Rhetorical, and Statistic. Where the uses of any word involve several or all of these elements, they are stated consecutively in the order of their development, so that we have the whole philosophy of the language, as well as an index of its ingredients. A dry study is thus greatly enlivened, and we are

continually impressed anew with the marvellous and curious processes which are combined in the human faculty of speech, in the invention of language, in its intangible creations, and with its perpetual hazards, which are held in check by laws somewhat more stringent than conventionalisms.

The translation of Dr. Freund's work has been made by Professor Robbins of Middlebury College, and Professor Turner of the Union Theological Seminary. The editor, Dr. Andrews, so far aided by others, has performed, we infer, the rest of the heavy task, by verifying all the citations of Dr. Freund, by condensing unnecessary redundancies, and by rectifying errors. These joint labors have given to us a work which deserves many years of distinguished favor. We hope that the seal of general approbation will give to the laborers a reward congenial to a scholar, whether pecuniary gain does or does not attend it.

2

The History of the Boston Athenæum, with Biographical Notices of its Deceased Founders. By JOSIAH QUINCY. Cambridge: Metcalf & Co. 1851. 8vo. pp. 264 and 104.

THE readers of the Memoir of Rev. J. S. Buckminster, by his sister, will remember that many of the pages of that delightful book contain references to the Boston Athenæum in its day of small things. The institution itself has a history, — a history worthy of being told. And who could tell that history better than one always the friend of the institution and its founders, and for many years its President? Mr. Quincy, whose labors will evidently cease only with his life, proves his love of usefulness, and his wisdom too, in employing his pen to so good a purpose. With that careful statement of all statistical and financial particulars which is needed to authenticate the rise and growth of any public institution among us, Mr. Quincy combines a literary history and a series of personal memoirs, which have an independent interest. The Athenæum originated in the "Anthology Club." The merchants of Boston have heretofore most liberally sustained it, by making themselves shareholders, and by large free gifts. Not the least interesting volume on the shelves of the new and splendid edifice in Beacon Street will henceforward be that which records the rise and growth of the institution itself.

3

The Half-Century; or a History of Changes that have taken place, and Events that have transpired, chiefly in the United States, between 1800 and 1850. By EMERSON DAVIS, D. D.

With an Introduction by MARK HOPKINS, D. D. Boston: Tappan & Whittemore. 1851. 12mo. pp. 444.

THE contents of this volume, and the way in which its subjects are treated, furnish no unfit simile of the period of time of whose changes and inventions it makes a record. We expect to suffer from confused dreams as we close it before retiring to rest, such a strange jumble of materials has the book introduced into our brain. The theme is too ponderous for the writer to manage well. He has indeed gathered together many interesting facts, but he did not see the whole of his subject. His religious prepossessions are apparent. Not a word is said of the growth of the Baptist denomination, of the Ministry at Large, of the extension of the Papal hierarchy over our land, nor of a score of other religious topics, which are vastly more important in their relations to the age than the issue with Dr. Bushnell. The book is on the whole, though with marked exceptions, good as far as it goes, but not what it should be with such a title as it bears. It reminds us of a Chinese map, in which the celestial empire fills the great central space, and all other countries appear as little islands.

41

The Island World of the Pacific: being the Personal Narrative and Results of Travel through the Sandwich or Hawaiian Islands, and other Parts of Polynesia. By REV. HENRY T. CREEVER. With Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. 12mo. pp. 406.

A CHARMING book, which we can read with confidence in the author's statements, and with unflagging interest in the fresh scenes which he brings so vividly before us. It is a most instructive book for young persons. The ocean paradises of which it makes report to us will, before long, be visited by summer tourists. We might specify blemishes in the book, but we forbear.

5-

Waverley Poetry: being the Poems scattered through the Waverley Novels. Attributed to Anonymous Sources, but presumed to be written by Sir Walter Scott. With Titles and Index. Boston: Munroe & Francis. 1851. 12mo. pp. 268.

THIS is certainly a very heterogeneous collection of scraps, carols, datches, and mottoes, with now and then a ballad or a lyric. There are some beautiful gems scattered through the volume, which are worthy of being brought together under a title bearing the name which thirty years ago was in the mouth of every reader of English.

American Unitarian Biography. Memoirs of Individuals who have been distinguished by their Writings, Character, and Efforts in the Cause of Liberal Christianity. Edited by WILLIAM WARE. Vol. II. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1851. 12mo. pp. 452.

WE are glad that Mr. Ware has found encouragement to continue his grateful undertaking. We would commend to all our readers the support of so thankworthy a purpose, in order that many more volumes may follow. The present contains Memoirs of Rev. Drs. Pierce, Channing, Tuckerman, Parker, and Bartlett, Rev. Messrs. Buckminster, Thacher, and Forster, Professor Frisbie, and Judges Story and Howe. The Memoir of Channing is by Rev. Dr. Furness, and that of Judge Story is by Rev. William Newell.

Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the Regal Succession of Great Britain. By AGNES STRICKLAND. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. 12mo. pp. 374.

MISS STRICKLAND has won the right of occupancy of a portion of the literary field which is most rich and attractive, and she has shown her ability to labor in it with unquestioned success. Margaret Tudor, Magdalene of France, and Mary of Lorraine, are commemorated with a practised skill in this volume. Many original materials are now for the first time wrought into their biographies. The promised life of Mary, Queen of Scots, will be looked for with a keen anticipation. The hints which the authoress drops in her Preface concerning that long promised work lead us to expect something very elaborate.

Essays and Reviews. By EDWIN P. WHIPPLE. In 2 vols. Second Edition. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 421, 408.

UPON the first publication of Mr. Whipple's Essays, about two years since, we took occasion to speak at considerable length of their merits; and upon the publication of his Lectures, a few months afterwards, an esteemed friend again extended a cordial greeting to him through our pages. We have therefore little to add at the present time to what has already been said. Besides the papers comprised in the first edition, the present edition contains two articles which are now first collected, — the essay on Henry Fielding, from the North American Review, and the re-

viewal of Dana's Poems and Prose Writings, from our own journal. The volumes now before us are stereotyped, and are issued in uniform style with the author's Lectures on Literature and Life. It is almost needless to add, that they are fine specimens of the typographical art; since the names of the publishers would alone be a sufficient guarantee that nothing more could be wished in the way of paper, types, or binding.

From Mr. Whipple's minute acquaintance with the subject in all its relations, we have long felt a strong desire that he might be induced to prepare a critical and popular History of English Literature. For such a task he is admirably qualified by all his studies; and we happen to know that he possesses ample and valuable materials for a work which, like Mr. Ticknor's History of Spanish Literature, should be an honor to our country. So far as our knowledge extends, there is no work that covers the ground over which a complete and well digested survey of English literature would pass. There are, indeed, valuable publications on special points and individual writers; but there is not a single work which presents a consistent and judicious history of the noblest literature that the world has ever seen. Chambers's Cyclopædia, and the numerous minor publications which have at different times fallen under our notice, are, in some respects, useful and necessary books for reference. But something more than they contain is imperatively called for; and it is discreditable to our regard for the great and immortal names with which our literary history abounds, that such a work does not exist. We commend this whole subject to Mr. Whipple's attention, with a full assurance that he is entirely competent to supply the want, and thus place his own name in a still more honorable place than it now occupies.

Celebrated Saloons, by MADAME GAY; and Parisian Letters, by MADAME GIRARDIN. Translated from the French, by L. WIL-LARD. 18mo. pp. 260.

AN extremely interesting and attractive work. The scenes are described and conversations related with much vivacity, and in a very attractive way. Some of the most remarkable subjects and persons of the time are brought forward in so fresh and lively a manner, as to give them a new interest. French life and thought, French society and spirit, are reflected in such a way from the saloons of Madame de Stæel, Josephine, Countess Merlin, &c., that we seem to be present and taking a personal part in what is said and done. It certainly must be considered one of the most pleasing and valuable of that class of books which the French

know how to make better than any other people. Books of this character are to most readers much more interesting than elaborate history or grave philosophy. The translator has rendered a good service to the reading public by bringing it so well into English, and it should be regarded as a most agreeable addition to our libraries.

10
—————
The Old Red Sandstone: or New Walks in an Old Field. By HUGH MILLER. Illustrated with numerous Engravings. From the Fourth London Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1851. 12mo. pp. 288.

THIS was the first scientific essay which brought into notice the genius of Mr. Miller. Self-taught as he was in the science of geology, the peculiar value of his two works lies in their adaptation to popular instruction. Though he uses of course the technical terms, — which we cannot but hope will one day be simplified, or at least shortened, — he is the most intelligible of geological writers, and enlivens his most erudite pages with scintillations of thought and wisdom, which address the feelings and the judgment of his readers. The illustrations are admirable.

//
—————
Principles of Zoölogy: teaching the Structure, Development, Distribution, and Natural Arrangement of the Races of Animals, living and extinct. With numerous Illustrations. Part I. Comparative Physiology. For the Use of Schools and Colleges. By LOUIS AGASSIZ and A. A. GOULD. Revised Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1851. 12mo. pp. 248.

THE reputation of this text-book of Zoölogy is already well established. By the simplicity of its method and the thoroughness of its analytical classification, as well as by its recognition of the most recent discoveries and hypotheses, it takes precedence of all other manuals upon its great theme. Messrs. Gould & Lincoln are doing good service to the community by the publication of these excellent scientific works.

12
—————
Faust: a Dramatic Poem, by GOETHE. Translated into English Prose, with Notes, etc., by A. HAYWARD, Esq. A new Edition. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 322.

FOR all who do not read German, Hayward is the authorized interpreter of Goethe's Faust, his translation being universally

acknowledged to be by far the best. The Boston publishers have given us in a very handsome shape a book which in the London edition is too costly for popular circulation. An apparatus of Preface, Notes, and Appendix furnishes abundant illustrations of all that is obscure in the masterpiece of the great idol of German literature.

13

Miscellaneous Essays. By THOMAS DE QUINCEY. Boston : Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 250.

THIS is the third volume of the collected works of De Quincey, a genius unrivalled in one peculiar vein of writing. Mr. Fields is more than a publisher of this series of striking works. He has done what the author of them could never be persuaded to do, — has collected from various sources the scattered productions of the only surviving member of a famed literary circle, and has put them within the reach of a large number of readers. We set a high value upon the three volumes, and look with interest for more.

Thanksgiving for the Union : A Discourse delivered in the Federal Street Meeting-house in Boston, on Thanksgiving Day, November 28, 1850. By EZRA S. GANNETT. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 8vo. pp. 22.

The Fugitive Slave Law : A Discourse delivered in the Congregational Church in West Bridgewater, November 17, 1850. By J. G. FORMAN. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 8vo. pp. 36.

The Limits of Civil Obedience : A Sermon preached in the First Church, Dorchester, January 12, 1851. By NATHANIEL HALL. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 8vo. pp. 26.

The State of the Nation, considered in a Sermon for Thanksgiving Day, preached at the Melodeon, November 28, 1850. By THEODORE PARKER. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 8vo. pp. 38.

The Great Controversy of States and People. Boston : Crosby & Nichols. 12mo. pp. 45.

Duty to Government and to God : A Sermon preached in the Warren Street Church, Boston, on Thanksgiving Day, November 29, 1850. By OTIS A. SKINNER. Boston : A. Tompkins & Co. 8vo. pp. 24.

THE above are the titles all of the pamphlets which have passed beneath our own eyes on the great theme which now agitates the nation. We have seen in the newspapers the titles of twice as many more that have been published, and references to scores that have been preached, on the same pregnant theme.

We were about to say, that whoever would take the pains to collect and read the whole of them would have the materials from which to form a fair and instructed judgment on the whole case at issue. But this would be to advance a proposition scarcely less vague than if we were to say, that any one who had all the letters of the alphabet before him would have all the materials for the statement of all truth and wisdom. We should be glad to give in our pages a well considered article upon the *Ethics of a Compromise*, and upon that most practical of all casuistical questions, the relations between conscience and law. We are withheld from uttering the thoughts now in our mind, because on all such matters we have a dread of all one-sided statements. Some of the most stirring pages of social and political history have brought under discussion the same casuistry of compromise, the same rebellion of conscience against law. When the noble and ever to be honored Sir Thomas More, Lord High Chancellor of England, refused to assent to the act which legalized the divorce of Henry the Eighth and Catharine, the following conversation was held in his examination before the Council at Lambeth. More had raised the plea of conscience. Says the *Abbot of Westminster*, "But you ought to think your conscience erroneous, when you have against you the whole council of the nation." *More*. "I should, if I had not for me a still greater council, — the whole council of Christendom." (*More's Works*, p. 1447.)

Dr. Gannett presents some of the causes for devout gratitude which are to be found in the union of these States, suggests some of the calamities which would ensue from its dissolution, and asserts that he sees no reason why the recent legislation upon slavery should bring about disunion. Mr. Skinner comes nearest to Dr. Gannett in the loyalty to law which is insisted upon in his Discourse, though he asserts that, while it is rebellion to resist a law by force, it is not unloyal to say that we cannot obey an oppressive law. Mr. Hall limits the allegiance due to civil government by the soul's sense of duty to God, and endeavours to establish this principle, and to guard it against abuse. Mr. Forman enters into a criticism of the Fugitive Slave Law, compares it with a provision in the law of Moses, and distinctly urges the duty of passive resistance. Mr. Parker's sermon is more general in its contents, making but incidental allusion to the law, and presenting a graphic and interesting *résumé*, in curt phrases and striking statements, of the comparative good and evil in the workings of our national system.

The anonymous pamphlet on the Great Controversy of States and People contains some admirable thoughts, and opens trains of sound reasoning. A little more thoroughness in its discussions, and a more careful elaboration of its main points, would give to it almost a judicial character.

“A Centennial Discourse, delivered September 9, 1850, before the First Church and Society in Athol, with an Appendix. By Samuel F. Clarke, Minister of the First Church. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1851.” (8vo. pp. 95.) This is one of the most interesting and lively of our numerous town and church commemorative discourses. Mr. Clarke has the true spirit of fondness for such a work, and has executed it with fine taste and with admirable skill. Its reference to the perils of the wilderness from the Indians, its piquant narrative of parish difficulties, its anecdotes of the change in the mode of singing, and of the church member who had *drank* a little and *smoked* a great deal, as well as its general felicity of style and its careful antiquarian investigations, will give the pamphlet a value to a wide circle of readers.

“Christ the Son of God. A Discourse in Review of the Rev. Dr. Wilkes’s Sermon, entitled ‘Who is Christ?’ delivered in the Unitarian Church, Montreal, January 19, 1851. By John Cordner. Montreal: James Potts. 1851.” (8vo. pp. 28.) “The Philosophic Origin and Historic Progress of the Doctrine of the Trinity: A Lecture delivered in the Unitarian Church, Montreal, January 26, 1851. By John Cordner. Montreal. 1851.” (8vo. pp. 22.) The circumstances which led to the delivery and the publication of these two sermons are stated on their pages. We could not name two other productions, in all our abundance of controversial literature, which we should regard as better suited to effect their purpose than these two sermons of Mr. Cordner. We have been surprised at the amount of instructive matter, of direct argument, of Biblical criticism, and of learned research, which they embrace. The writer’s directness and simplicity of style adapt the discourses to popular use. His learning does not obscure his meaning. His sketch of the origin and history of the doctrine of the Trinity is a masterly performance. We hope that the Unitarian Association will reprint these sermons, and give them a wide circulation.

“Marks of the True Church, by Austin Craig (Peapack, Somerset County, New Jersey). Reprinted from the ‘Christian Union and Religious Review.’” (8vo. pp. 16.) The causes of the division of Christendom into sects being briefly stated, Mr. Craig proceeds to present, in the language of Scripture, and with brief comments, four marks of the True Church, namely, Unity, Sanctity, Universality, and Apostolicity. With no waste of argument, the writer expresses himself effectively, and with the Gospel warrant.

“Minutes of a General Convention of the Christian Church, held at Marion, New York, October, 1850. Philadelphia. 1851.” (8vo. pp. 24.) The especial objects which occupied this convention were the adoption of measures for raising \$100,000 to found a University, and for a more perfect and general organiza-

tion of the Christian denomination, and discussions with reports upon various matters of reform and Christian enterprise.

“Remarks on an Article in the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, concerning a recent Discourse delivered before the Convention of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts. By Edwards A. Park, Abbot Professor in Andover Theological Seminary.” (8vo. pp. 48.) We took up this pamphlet, intending only to glance over its pages, but were so fascinated by its rich diction, and the acuteness and precision of its deprecatory arguments, that we could not deny ourselves an honest perusal. The Princeton Reviewer did foul injustice to Professor Park, but the Professor, with admirable temper, yet with the very keenest skill, parries every aim, and nobly keeps erect. The charm of the pamphlet lies in the felicity with which diffuseness and repetition are wholly freed from weariness by a constant variety in the turn of expression, and the perpetual freshness of phrases used simply to say the same things over and over again. The controversy relates to that remarkable sermon of Professor Park’s, entitled “The Theology of the Intellect and that of the Feelings.” The perusal of the pamphlet before us will brighten the wits of the dullest theologian. As an incidental illustration of the unrivalled literary excellence of the Scriptures, it is of high value.

“The Mormons. A Discourse delivered before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, March 26, 1850. By Thomas L. Kane. Philadelphia: King & Baird. 1850.” (8vo. pp. 92.) We apprehend that the perusal of this pamphlet would surprise many persons who know nothing of the Mormons, save what they have learned from newspaper paragraphs. Mr. Kane gives us a narrative of personal experience and observation among this singular people. In a very spirited and earnest plea in their behalf, he represents them as a sincere, pure, laborious, and much injured community, whose faith is not composed entirely of stupid and fanatical ingredients, and whose mode of life would do credit to any class of human beings. We thank Mr. Kane for a pleasant and profitable hour with his Discourse, but we should be glad to ask him some questions.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Grote's History of Greece.—This voluminous and most admirable history, beyond comparison the best of the eight works which bear the same title, has already been reviewed in our pages up to the eighth vol-

ume, and has been highly commended by us. A Boston firm has had the enterprise to undertake its republication, and we hope that they will be abundantly rewarded. John P. Jewett & Co. have already issued two volumes of their reprint, which will be embraced in ten volumes, to appear at brief intervals. The reprint is from the second London edition. These volumes contain *Legendary Greece*, and the historic period to the reign of Peisistratus.

Lavengro, The Scholar, The Gypsy, The Priest. — The author of this medley, George Borrow, Esq., has already engaged a welcome hearing from the lovers of racy literature by his two popular works, "The Bible in Spain," and "The Gypsies of Spain." We have received his new work too late to enable us to pronounce upon it in our present number. We promise ourselves high pleasure from its perusal. George P. Putnam, of New York, has published a handsome edition of it (12mo, pp. 550), and by the efforts which he made to secure the sheets from England, and to present the work in a proper form, he is entitled to the market.

There are some fine passages and some gleaming thoughts in "The Bards of the Bible, by George Gilfillan." (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. 12mo. pp. 378.) A writer of any sensibility and skill could hardly deal with such a theme without a degree of success, for his material is in a great measure already wrought into form. The book is disfigured, however, by much faulty rhetoric, and by remarks which shock the taste of the reader, while offences against reverence are by no means rare in it.

For poetry we have before us "The Poetical Remains of the late Mary Elizabeth Lee, with a Biographical Memoir by S. Gilman, D. D." (Charleston, S. C.: Walker & Richards. 1851. 12mo. pp. 224.) And "The Dove and The Eagle." (Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 27.) Miss Lee's poems are characterized by heartiness and simplicity rather than by any brilliancy of genius. Their topics are naturally found in the common scenes of life, and are treated with a healthful tone and with a pure spirit. Dr. Gilman's Memoir is dictated by a respectful affection for one who was worthy of it. The Dove and the Eagle is a little piece of covert satire on some present agitations, set forth in an airy colloquy between the two birds as representatives of certain human qualities which they respectively symbolize. One must read the poem for himself if he would know its drift.

"Malleville, a Franconia Story, by the Author of the Rollo Books," (New York, Harper & Brothers, 18mo, pp. 219,) is an attractive little volume, with a profitable moral. Its scenery is in the interesting northern region of our own Franconia, and its pictures of winter sports will fix the gaze of the boys at least.

Messrs. Crosby & Nichols have republished, for the Massachusetts Temperance Society, the *Essay on the Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors in Health and Disease*, by William B. Carpenter. To this Essay was awarded the prize of one hundred guineas offered by an English gentleman. Mr. Carpenter, a son of the late Rev. Dr. Carpenter, is one of the most distinguished physiologists of the age, and his *Essay* has been highly commended.

Messrs. Phillips, Sampson, & Co. will soon publish works under the following titles:—"The Worcester Pulpit; being an Historical Account of each Religious Society in the City of Worcester, from its Organization to the Present Time, by Rev. Elam Smalley, D. D." "The True Remedy for Woman's Wrongs, by Catharine E. Beecher." "The Religion of Geology, and its Collateral Sciences, by President Hitchcock." "Life in Varied Phases, by Mrs. Catharine H. Butler." And a new and improved edition of "Margaret, a Tale of the Real and Ideal," by Rev. Mr. Judd.

Messrs. Ticknor, Reed, & Fields will continue their publication of a complete collection of De Quincey's Works by a fourth volume, containing "The Cæsars." They have in press a second edition of the "Memoirs of Dr. and Joseph S. Buckminster." Also, "Warreniana," a collection in the style of the Rejected Addresses; Goethe's Wilhelm Meister; a new romance by Hawthorne; and the Poems of Henry T. Tuckerman.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

A Pagan's Opinion of Christianity. — Proclamation of a Mandarin.
— We have read with interest (in the *Journal des Debats*, taken from a Chinese paper of the 29th of October last) the proclamation below, as a singular instance of the effect which Christianity produces on a mind evidently not without culture and widely extended information, standing outside of it, and in an attitude hostile to it. Of the many millions of our brethren at our antipodes, we have known but little save that they call us barbarians, and we have given them the credit of knowing utterly nothing about us. But the mandarin Vau is evidently quite familiar with the main truths (or errors) of Christianity as received by the majority of men. Vau is a mandarin of no very high rank, ruling a small part of the province of Canton, lying to the northeast, and wearing a white button in his cap (which indicates, the *Journal* tells us, the fifth in the sacred orders). He must be a man of some sense, for his arguments against the *phase* of religion which has come before his vision are conclusive. We commend to all believers in the Trinity the Chinaman's unsophisticated question, "How could a body that was master of heaven be so little master of itself that it could be spiked on the cross by the hands of vulgar mortals?" and the equally sound common sense which follows. His view of German politics and the comparison with Japan may excite a smile, but the argument certainly meets the case in hand, and answers the governor's purpose.

The occasion of the proclamation was briefly this. The daughter of a Christian, in the department Kayingchau, a province of Canton, married a Pagan. Her efforts to convert her husband's family excited their indignation, and they appealed to Vau, who set on foot a general persecution, destroyed one or more churches, and imprisoned several Christians, and, among others, a French missionary. This happened on the 31st of last August. On the 17th of September, the French minister, informed of the fact, interfered. The designs of Vau were arrested by the higher authorities, the missionary set at liberty, and the privilege secured to the Christians to establish and extend their church. We translate from the French translation.

“Yau, governor of the lower department of Kayingchau (province of Canton), etc., orders the publication of the present proclamation, so that the hearts of men may be held in the right road, and the laws retain the respect which is their due.

“Know, then, that there exists in the Western world a doctrine introduced there by Jesus. So long as the barbarians propagate or practise this doctrine among themselves, explain their books, and adore the Lord of heaven according to their liturgy, we have nothing to say; but it is not permitted them to introduce themselves into the central empire for the purpose of preaching this doctrine; and such subjects of the celestial empire as aid these strangers, come from distant countries, in penetrating into our territories, league themselves with them, inflame and trouble the spirit of the people, seduce the women to this doctrine, or commit any other offence against the laws, are punishable. The terms of the code are explicit; who will dare to violate them!

“In this department, the literary doctrines recognized by the law (i. e. Buddhism, Confucianism, and rationalism) are held in high consideration, and the character of the inhabitants is justly esteemed; descended from persons who have filled public offices, or bound to such functionaries by ties of blood, they certainly will not abandon the science of the sages and of the more illustrious by their virtues throughout the central empire, in order to run at a venture in chase of another doctrine. It has, however, come to my knowledge, that the simple and unenlightened inhabitants of the village of Chukaug and its vicinity have recently invited men of distant countries to come to them, and that some of them have concluded to unite themselves with these strangers, and that the women even have been affiliated to this new society, a serious infraction of the laws. It is, then, my duty to seek out those who have been guilty of giving aid to the strangers in coming to the country, to cause them to be arrested and severely punished according to the tenor of the laws anciently adopted, and also to publish a proclamation for the instruction of the people. In consequence, I publish the present for the instruction of all, the military as well as others.

“You will all know that Jesus, born in the time of Ngaiti, of the dynasty of the Hans, ought not to occupy in the estimation of man a higher rank than Hwatoh (Hippocrates of China), and others, since he could do no more than solace men by curing their diseases. The power which he had of nourishing a multitude of three thousand men with seven leaves of bread is no more a reality than the services of the rationalists. In other respects, there was no particular merit in it. As to his extravagant title of Lord who created the heavens, remember the princes, emperors, great philosophers, who shed civilization abroad, and were the agents of heaven a thousand and ten thousand years before Jesus. Believe that the different countries situated beyond the sea have had from the beginning of the world sovereigns, inhabitants, forms of government, and laws for the punishment of crime; is it, then, possible to say that none of these existed before Jesus appeared on the earth to create them from the time of the dynasty of the Hans.

“In the Hai-kwoh-tu-chi (an embellished Chinese encyclopædia of recent date, of which the famous Liu is said to be the author) you will discover that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was the wife of a man called Joseph, but that Jesus denied his father, and that, regarding himself as the child of his mother conceived while she was a virgin, he falsely affirmed that he was her glorious son created by Heaven. The converts to his

doctrine permit, then, no sacrifice to ancestors, or sovereigns, or the sacred representatives of supernatural beings. They trouble the spirit of the people with doubts, they teach them to believe that there exists neither heaven, nor law, nor father, nor sovereign superior to Jesus; that there is neither filial piety nor fidelity to the prince, nor sympathy for their equals, nor moral duties. Thus, the anger of Heaven was excited, and its judgment fell upon Jesus.

“In the name of Heaven, the king of Judea caused him to be seized, and, his crime having been proved, he was punished, according to the laws of the realm, by death on the cross. His blood flowed in such quantities that his body was covered with it. In seven days he was dead, and orders were given to the local authorities to have him buried. But his disciples, people without legal employment or means of subsistence, invented a fable, and pretended that, after having passed three days in the tomb, he revived, and forty days later ascended to heaven. This account was invented for the purpose of attracting men to the doctrine which they preached; but it resembles that which was told of Suu-Nyau, who, according to the story of his partisans, having been drowned after the defeat of his troops, became a spirit of the waters. It resembles, also, the fables of the faction of the white Lys, who declare that the bodies of their comrades, put to death by long and ignominious tortures, surrendered the spirits which animated them, and that they, disengaging themselves, mounted to heaven, called to another state among celestial beings.

“The fact could not have been as they relate, for if it were, how would it be possible that a body which was the master of heaven was so little master of itself that it could be put to death and spiked upon a cross by the hands of vulgar mortals! The incredible assertion of his disciples, that in his dignity of Lord of heaven he suffered the pains of sin for the love of man is as extremely ridiculous. Thus, to conceal the shame of a death on the cross, the body which is the grand minister of heaven and earth could do every thing except to remit to man the punishment of their sins, and, in order to accomplish this, he was obliged to submit to chastisement in their place.

“This doctrine pretends also to encourage virtue and repress vice; but the learned have always said the same. The dogma which pretends that the believers on the Lord of heaven will be happy, and that after death their spirits will mount to heaven, while those who do not believe will be exposed to all miseries, and after death their spirits will be condemned to the eternal prison of hell, — this doctrine is precisely the same as that of Wu-sau-sz: — ‘Those who are good to me are good; those who are vile to me are vile.’ Suppose that the believers on the Lord of heaven should be thieves or vicious persons, they will nevertheless be happy, while those who have not believed, although just and meritorious persons, are all condemned to misery. Never has that Divine Providence, which recompenses virtue and punishes vice, been changed and confounded on this point. Is not this doctrine fatal to those notions of good which heaven has given us?

“Then, the words ‘palace of heaven’ and ‘prison of hell’ are only plagiarisms from the most modern Buddhist books, and still the Christians scorn the Buddhists as people condemned to the eternal prison of hell. The crucifixion of Jesus while living is, like the tree of three swords and the mountain of arms in the hell of the Buddhists, absolutely impossible to prove.

“Be it known further, that, of all the nations beyond the seas, none has such strong faith in the Lord of heaven as Germany, and still her inhabitants are torn from all social and political bonds. Her power is in ruins, her territory has been more than once divided. Why, then, since she believes on the Lord of heaven, has not happiness been given her? Among the countries which do not believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, none can compare with Japan. Upon the quay of her port, open to strangers, is graven a cross, and every merchant who comes there, who at his landing does not trample this image at once under foot, is immediately decapitated to serve for an example to others. Yet more. At the gate of the city is an image of Jesus buried in the soil, in order that it may be trampled under foot every day, and still this realm has lasted two thousand years. Why has not the Lord of heaven inflicted a terrible punishment upon it? This proves that the pretended power of rendering happy or unhappy is a fable without foundation. Its effects are plainly that, in this life, ignorant people leave the tombs of their ancestors without the sacrifices which are due to them, without perfumed incense, without the prescribed oblation; and that after death, they will be, in their turn, blind spectres, subjected to, beside the privations which I have just enumerated, the punishment of burning till their bones shall be reduced to ashes. What happiness can result from such a doctrine!

“Although an ordinance of recent date has recognized the right of the barbarians to discourse among themselves upon their sacred books of religion, it is not allowed them to establish themselves in the central empire, to mingle with its inhabitants, and to propagate their doctrines among them. If, then, there are those who invite the strangers, who unite with them for the purpose of agitating and troubling the public spirit, of converting the females, or violating the law in any way, they will be punished either by strangulation after imprisonment, or by transportation, or by the bastinado; the law allows no commutation. If, however, the guilty come of their own accord, and surrender themselves to the authorities, declare their repentance, and trample the cross under foot, in that case the punishment will be in some degree milder. The laws of the state are severe; but they have always left repentance open to the culpable. If, then, there are among you, simple people, any who have suffered themselves to be led astray, let them hasten to enter the path of safety; but know ye who persevere in crime, that it is my duty to arrest, condemn, and punish you, that ye may serve for examples to the perverse. The families of scholars, those whose members are in the public service, those who are descended from ancient functionaries, must make their resolutions known in the temples of their ancestors, expel from their tribes all children or brothers who may have adopted this doctrine as persons who have renounced the society of their relatives, dead and living. In the jurisdictions of the country, the magistrates of the village, and the principal inhabitants, should be prompt to inform; and if they discover members of any society who are employed in propagating this doctrine, they should give them no time to seduce or agitate the population, but they ought immediately to inform their superiors, and aid in arresting the guilty, if they would not themselves be treated as accomplices.

“By these means the hearts of men will be kept in the right way, and the laws will be more solemnly observed. It is my earnest wish that it may be so. Let each one tremble and obey.”

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

MAY, 1851.

ART. I. — PREACHING, AND THE AFTERNOON SERVICE.

THERE is too much preaching. There is too much preaching for the preacher. There is too much preaching for the hearer. Channing once said to the writer of this article, "I think there are too many sermons. One in a month, perhaps, — an earnest one, listened to with interest as an unusual privilege, — would make more impression." He did not mean, of course, to recommend so great a change; but to present his thought with the form of contrast. An aged and eminent clergyman still among us, it is well known, — one of a kindred school and spirit, — for many years of his active ministry, withdrew his main strength from the pulpit, to give it to parochial visitation. It is really time to raise a doubt about this much preaching.

There is too much preaching for the people. Choose the most interesting subject in the world besides religion, — let it be some science or art, or some practical interest of life, as education or politics, — or a combination of all subjects, the subject of all subjects, the philosophy of life and of humanity, — and what would be the effect on the public mind of two discourses a week upon it, the year round and life through? Suppose it were treated in the most methodical and scientific manner, and carried

the mind forward from step to step, and to the highest point of culture; what would be the effect of so much teaching? Would not the pupils grow weary of it? What class could bear unending philosophy courses? But now suppose the discoursing were desultory and vague, although sincere and earnest; that it seldom opened any fresh fountains or unfolded any new facts; that it did not carry forward the mind with any decided steps, but left it in age very nearly where it was in youth; then what would probably be the effect? Would it not be a great weariness of such teaching? Would there not be a great merit in attending upon it? Should we not hear men enumerating it among their most meritorious actions and greatest sacrifices to conscience, that they had not missed a single lecture for the whole year? Suppose one of the lecturers were to say, what a preacher was heard to say one Sunday evening, that he had delivered five discourses that day, — even that would be a great merit; but it would be nothing to the merit of having heard them.

Can it be well that religious instruction should be so arranged as necessarily to produce this feeling of repletion, dulness, weariness? One sermon a Sunday would be strain enough upon the capacity of the hearer to be interested. The plan of one sermon a Sunday would be perilous enough; and it may be said that the supposition just made militates almost equally against that. And so it does, unless preaching be something different from what it commonly is, a stately and formal discourse, — unless it so mingle and blend with the devotions of the people as to breathe into their souls and bear up the offering of worship, which is for ever interesting. But if preaching be this great, and solemn, and touching spiritual ministration which fills the soul with worship, with adoration, with sacred and overwhelming sense of the truths uttered, even then the ministration should not be repeated the same day. The same train of thoughts cannot be carried with equal effect into a second service. Another train of thoughts equally touching and impressive will only displace the first. The whole matter of the day's meditation will be vague and confused. The hearer will not carry the same distinct impression with him into the week, which one discourse might have given

him. The next day he will not know, probably, what was the subject of either discourse. But if the effect of so much preaching, even of the highest kind, is thus questionable, far more so is that of the ordinary preaching. It falls with stunning effect upon the public ear; and the sufficient proof of this fact is, that, in general, preaching is proverbially the dullest thing in the world.

These will probably be thought to be very rash words. What, it will be said, is to be done with the afternoon of Sunday? What is to be done with the second service? These are questions to be answered when they are fairly reached. If there were no difficulties about the afternoon service, all this would be not only rash, but superfluous and irrelevant. If there were no intrinsic difficulties, then there would be nothing to be done but to lay the blame on the religious indolence or apathy of the people. It is well known, however, that there are difficulties, and it is believed that there are intrinsic difficulties; and it is believed, too, that the time has come for them to be plainly dealt with. But let us proceed.

There is too much preaching for the preacher. There is a strain upon the powers of the preacher, both in preparing and in delivering so many sermons, that is very little understood. The sermon, it is to be considered, is not what it was fifty years ago. It costs far more effort. It does not fall into the beaten track of custom, — at least not with the true men of the age. It cannot be extracted from books or bodies of divinity. It does not consist of a first, and secondly, and thirdly, and a conclusion or improvement. It is more practical. It deals more with life, and the life-conscience, and the varied interests of life; in short, it is a far more original production. The work is as if a poet should write a poem every week, or a lawyer should make a great plea every week. No man could bear it. "No man," said a very eminent physician, whose name would, if quoted, be the highest authority, "no man can put forth his utmost intellectual strength in a sermon or speech every week, and live, or, at any rate, live in health. At least," said he, "I never knew any man but Kirkland that could do it. You must write three sermons carelessly, *currente calamo*, on some easy theme, or in an easy way. Upon the fourth, i. e. once a month, you may lay out all your strength." "Yes," was

the reply, "but here is the difficulty. Where is the easy theme to be found, and how is the easy way to be discovered? There is no small case for the preacher, as there is for the lawyer. Every point in religion is to fixed thought like the burning-glass when its rays are steadily concentrated upon one spot; it must kindle every thing into a flame. No theme can really touch the conscience and the highest welfare, but it will lay hold upon every energy and feeling; and even then, all effort to do it justice comes far short."

There is too much preaching, let it be repeated, for the preacher. First, he writes too many sermons. Formerly clergymen wrote three, four, five thousand sermons in a life, and lived easy and well to a great age. They cannot do so now. Where, in our pulpits, are the aged ministers? There are some that are looking old, at the age of fifty or fifty-five; and no wonder. No preacher should ever think of writing more than one sermon a week, and that is too much. But if he writes but one sermon a week, and preaches two, what follows? He must repeat his sermons. And what then? Why in five or ten years, if not sooner, his sermons have been repeated till they will bear repetition no longer; and then he must leave the parish. This, more than any thing else, perhaps, accounts for what is felt by some to be a great scandal in our day, — the unsettled condition and almost nomadic wandering of our clergy. The people complain of it; the public journals cast reproach upon it; and, if they hear of a man who has kept his pulpit twenty or thirty years, laud the instance as a kind of redeeming marvel of the times; but if there is to be any essential relief from the difficulty, it must be found in the demand for fewer sermons.

Secondly, the preacher preaches too many sermons. Too much is required of him in this way, whether the reasonableness of the thing be considered, or the health of the man, or the effect upon his mind. It is unreasonable. Let it be understood, that not only the sermon, but the other services, are to be taken into the account. Earnest prayer is more exhausting than preaching. To this whole service, then, of devotion and discourse, suppose that a man has given himself for an hour and a half, with the utmost intensity of all his thoughts and

feelings. It is unreasonable to ask him to do that again, two or three hours afterwards. It is not in human nature to do it, with the fresh and living earnestness that properly belongs to such a service. It could be more easily done immediately. In two or three hours the whole system is run down to the lowest point. The exhaustive effect of the service is most felt then. In the first hour after service, the effect is not so much exhaustion as suffering; many persons, immediately after such an effort, feel a pain in their bones, a racking of the nerves, and as if they wanted to lie down upon a board or upon some hard place,—if the reader can understand what that means. But to this, after a time, succeeds utter languor. And then it is wrong to preach and pray again. It is, one is tempted to say, a kind of sacrilege. Many a preacher has felt what an earnest man was lately heard to say, “God forgive me my afternoon services!” He remembers the words, “And will ye offer the lame for sacrifice?” He could better speak to men if that were all; but to offer a solemn and prolonged service of prayer to God, in such a state of debility and languor, is something dreadful. Let not this be thought to be overstrained sentiment, or an overstrained account of the matter. It is simple truth. It is a terrible reality to many an earnest man. Few hearers, perhaps, comprehend what is this stupendous service of prayer and meditation. Many look upon it as something professional, mechanical, a matter of course; they see no reason why it cannot be repeated two or three times a day. They are mistaken! They are mistaken, that is to say, unless the system has made the preacher mechanical; and then it is no matter how much he preaches, and not much matter how little. But a man really alive and in earnest will suffer in the way here stated,—will suffer in conscience, too,—in the consciousness that he is called to perform a service for which he is religiously unfit. The celebrated Edward Irving, who, with all his mistakes, was a really earnest man, while drawing crowds to his church in Hatton Garden in the morning, fell into such an ordinary strain of discourse in the second service, that one could hardly recognize him for the same man: and he plainly said, “You demand a second sermon of me, and I will give it; but I cannot preach; I will read a dis-

course to you." Every strong preacher will feel the same thing, and if he arouse himself, as Mr. Irving would not, to do all in his power, still a discerning hearer may easily see the difference,— a certain tone of sadness or depression in the prayer, and in the sermon, not the true, deep, welcoming, joyous, free outburst of the heart, but a certain unnatural or diseased earnestness, as if, indeed, the theme could never be uninteresting, but as if it fell on sore and sick nerves. One wants to preach on death, or hell, or sin, or sorrow, in such a frame, and it will be found, probably, that most sermons of the dark and mournful cast do come in the afternoon. It will be hard then to speak of the love and goodness of God, for the mind is not in the buoyant state that is fitted for the theme.

And all this, though it is of less consequence, must have an effect upon the health. The clergy — at least within the range known to most of our readers — are more out of health than any other profession. There are scarcely any old men among them. More of them travel abroad every year for their health, than of all other professions. Mr. Southey remarked that fact to the writer many years ago.

Then, again, upon the mind of the preacher, this incessant repetition of his great task must have an injurious effect. The spirit of routine is the great peril of the profession, as sympathy with suffering is its great trial. The mind is apt to be in a hot-bed of religious influences. The free, fresh, common air of life does not circulate enough in the preacher's study. His views of life, of duty, of religion, are liable to be unreasonable, extravagant, depressed, visionary. They want practicalness and common sense. They want a healthy tone. The people feel this, and give but half the weight to the preacher's words which the most solemn and momentous of all words should have. All this comes, in part at least, from over-work, from an over-excited brain and an over-burdened heart.

Thus much has been said with a view to prepare the way for the question, What is to be done with the afternoon service?

It is not to be concealed that there are difficulties about this service; that these difficulties are becoming ap-

parent in all Protestant countries, and especially in the larger villages and towns; that they are revealing themselves particularly among the more intelligent classes, wherever the pulpit leaves them any freedom to think and act for themselves. In Protestant countries it is that the difficulty is felt, for the Roman Church has nothing to do with it. It does not require its people to attend upon so much preaching. "Poor, blinded creatures," doubtless many a Protestant thinks, "that hear but one sermon a day, if so much!" The Roman Church has repeated masses, but not for the same persons. It has a numerous priesthood, and it is seldom that any of them preach twice on a Sunday. This much preaching, in fact, is a Protestant usage; it came in with Protestantism; it had its fitness for its time; the people wanted instruction; this new system wanted explanation; the laity could not read; books were rare; the pulpit was sole instructor. But now all this is changed; the need of so much preaching is diminished; the usage is wearing itself out. In London many of the churches are permanently closed in the afternoon. It is not uncommon to hear a man say in England that he always goes to church in the morning; that he never goes in the afternoon. In this country the same tendency is manifest. In many of our city churches the afternoon attendance is constantly declining; no efforts of the clergy can keep it up; nothing can keep it up, but a conviction wrought in the minds of the people that it is their bounden duty to come. They say, if they say what they feel, that they do not want to come; that they are heavy and dull after dinner; that they are likely to go to sleep; that they do not see that it is any advantage to them; that they can read better sermons at home than they are likely to hear at church. And they say what is true.

What, then, is to be done with the afternoon service? Several things may be proposed.

First, defer it till evening. It is, wherever the change has been made, an inexpressible relief to the preacher; it is an immense advantage to the hearer,—that is, if he proposes any rational benefit to himself in going to church. Both speaker and hearer come fresh to the service. The whole aspect of an audience is different from that of an afternoon service.

Some may object, that this would cut them off from a very agreeable family or friendly reunion to which they are accustomed on Sunday evening, and they may decidedly say that they cannot and will not consent to it. Be it so. Still, more, and many more, will go in the evening than in the afternoon. Experiment proves this beyond all doubt.

But it may be said, What will people do with Sunday afternoon if there is no service? Will it not be a dangerous innovation? Will it not lead to license and disorder? Does it produce this result in those congregations that defer the service till evening? Are our people so ignorant and undomestic, that they cannot spend an afternoon quietly at home in reading and conversation? And if they should walk abroad, would there be any harm in that? Even in the less instructed Catholic population of Europe, filling the streets and public squares with crowds, one seldom sees any thing that violates the decorum of the day. We talk about a Jewish rigor in Sabbath-keeping. Why, the Jewish Sabbath was a holiday compared with ours. There was to be a complete abstinence from work; but this was all in favor of the cheerfulness of the day. Jahn says it was observed very much as holidays were among other nations. The truth is, ours is not a Jewish, but a Puritan rigor.

Secondly, whether the service be in the afternoon or evening, let it be of an entirely different character from the morning service. One great and solemn season of prayer and meditation is enough for one day; let the other occasion be devoted to the instruction and enlightenment of the congregation, — in the knowledge of the Bible, in the history of the Church, in the biography of good men, in the boundless field of natural theology. The manner of this teaching might be varied to suit the subject and the convenience or the gifts of the preacher. Sometimes it might be by written discourse, sometimes by extemporaneous exposition, sometimes by easy instruction, as in a school. The teacher might stand up in the midst of the congregation, and, proposing his subject or passage of Scripture, say upon it, in an informal manner, what occurred to him, and then invite questions from those around him. He might find occasion, in such

easy and informal communication, to let drop many an important remark, for which, perhaps, he never finds place in his elaborate discourses. There is reason to believe that a congregation so instructed for ten years would become a phenomenon among our churches.

It were easy to multiply suggestions upon this plan. Let there be a good parish library collected in furtherance of it. Let there be a library-room built, as a pendant to every church, large enough for conferences and the Sunday School. Let the youngest children of the congregation be taught here during the hour of the afternoon meeting; all above twelve years old, upon the plan proposed, would be best instructed with the congregation at large; and the Sunday School teachers would not then, as now, have their whole Sunday employed in public services. In fine, let the congregation resolve itself into a Christian school. Let it say, "We meet once on Sunday for a great and solemn act of worship; we meet again to study our religion, its records, its history, its evidences, and the great book of God's teaching in the world around us."

Thirdly, in country churches, unless this plan is adopted, abolish the second service entirely. Make the one service longer, if it is desired. It might, perhaps, be divided into two parts, the worship-service and the school-service, each an hour long. This would be preferable to a long interval between the two.

The present plan is open to such great and serious objections, that it is surprising they should not have drawn attention, and led to the inquiry whether some change could not be effected. Observe a farmer's family, living three or four miles from church, and see what the Sunday routine must be; for it is all routine, and no quiet, or quiet meditation. All the morning is occupied with cares pertaining to the household, in doors or out doors, and the family has barely time to get to church in season for the morning service. In the interval of an hour or two between the service, they saunter about without any opportunity for reading or thought, or any thing else that is profitable or comfortable; or else they attend a prayer-meeting, which, under the circumstances, is very sure to be heavy and dull. After the second service they return home; and by the time they have taken their sup-

per and fed the cattle in winter, or attended to the dairy in summer, it is night. Here is a day without leisure, without repose, without reading, without private meditation, without any quiet family reunion, — wanting almost every thing that should characterize a Sunday, — a day of rest.

It may be said, that the people like it; that they are too quiet and solitary during the week; that they want to talk with one another and prefer movement to repose. Let the objection have whatever weight belongs to it; but is it enough to turn the day of rest into a day of routine, and driving about, and of total unrest? The people need to acquire habits of reading and self-communion. A day is given for mental and spiritual culture. Does this religious dissipation best answer the purpose? What might not a seventh day do, wisely devoted to the fulfilment of its proper ends? It might, in no great length of time, change the face of the world!

But whatever be thought of these suggestions, — and the writer would very gladly listen to better ones, — yet they certainly involve matters of great interest, — the utility of Sunday, and the vitality of the ministry.

The time must come when this seventh part of life will receive a new, and a new kind of consideration; when the question will be, not merely how to lay more restrictions upon the day, but how to give it more efficiency; when, like any other seventh part of the time of life, it will be subjected to the rational question, How can it be turned to the best account? It has been called the Lord's day, till it is forgotten that it is man's day, that it was "made for man." It has somehow dropped out of the account of time. No man asks what he shall do with Sunday, with a determination to do something, as he asks what he shall do with Monday or Tuesday; still less, with the same practical freedom of thought, to consider what he can best do with it. Every other day must have its business and purpose, its purpose well settled and its business well arranged, but Sunday may take care of itself.

Let the great claim of rest be fairly admitted. There is no intention in this communication to drive matters hard with any body. Let the plea be listened to that says, "I am weary; I am worn out with toil and care

and perplexity ; let me rest ; let me alone ; let me be alone, free from the janglings and importunities of the world ; let me have one day for myself." Yes, be it so ; be the day such, — a breathing-time in the race of life, a pause in its hurry and struggle, a sacred inclosure fenced in from the common world, as the first and best of all days.

But best it cannot be, nor happiest, if it be given up to utter indolence, to desultory wandering of the mind, to lounging upon beds and sofas. No mortal can pass a day in utter idleness, without finding it as wearisome as useless. Let there be rest ; but let there be a mingling with brethren and friends in holy and reverent worship of the Infinite Goodness ; and let there be private reading and thought ; and then let there be a walk to refresh the spirits ; and then let there be pleasant family communion. Let the man be awake, — bright and alive ; let him not fear that a merry saying or a joyous laugh will profane the day ; let him not bind down his faculties to superstitious stupor, speaking with constraint, and looking demure, and making a dismal ado of his religion, — making, in fact, the Sabbath day a sort of incubus upon his life.

It were positively better for a man to learn a language or study the mathematics on Sunday, and so to improve his mind, than to pass it in the way that many do. But there is a better thing than this ; and that is to devote the day cheerfully, rationally, freely, to the great training for which it is given, — to worship, to thoughtfulness, to the study of the Bible, to the study of nature, to the ever-onward progress that links these Sabbath days to the days of eternity.

Then for the vitality of the ministry, — the matters of this discussion much concern it.

Can any body tell why the greatest speeches in the world are not sermons, — the speeches, not of Demosthenes, and Cicero, and Burke, and Chatham, and Mirabeau, but of Massillon, and Robert Hall, and Channing ? They are not. Why are they not ? There is no subject so sublime, no interest so momentous, as that of religion ; nothing that ought so to call out all the faculties of a man in eloquent speech.

Now there are, doubtless, many reasons for this ; and before all stands as a reason the want of a true, a gen-

nine religious culture. The clergyman does not as truly and vitally apprehend the objects of his calling, as does the lawyer or physician his objects. He does not as distinctly see the connection of cause and effect as they do. His sermon is not to cure disease, like the doctor's prescriptions, or to cut to the quick, like the surgeon's knife, or to rescue property or honor, like the lawyer's plea. And yet, if he saw the truth, he would see that it goes deeper and sharper to the vitality of all things than any of these.

But next to this want of seeing and feeling the matter is the formalism, mannerism, routine, that have stolen over the sacred office. Preaching, in the manner of it, is like no other speaking. It is manacled, fettered, burdened, as with some spell of dulness. It wants the free and fresh tone of living earnestness. There are exceptions, doubtless, but this is the general character of it. Why is it? For this reason, it is believed, among others, that the preacher is put to the constant and endless repetition of the same thing over and over again. Upon the elastic spring of his mind there is a perpetual weight. It is almost impossible in these circumstances to resist the spirit of routine; and whatever can properly be done to abridge or vary his tasks should be done.

You complain that the preacher is uninteresting, dull, formal; and yet, with a strange sort of formalistic persistence of your own, you demand more and more of this same dull preaching, — as if every dull sermon you hear added to your chance of salvation. Why drive the preacher so hard, if you would leave any fresh life in him? You would treat your horse more wisely. Why set his brains seething every week with unnatural excitement, till they are sodden in dulness and formality?

This is a subject of uncalculated importance. The people take their leading and abiding impressions of religion from the preacher; and in making these impressions, his manner has as much effect upon them as his matter, — perhaps more. What a backward and half-depressed manner is there in almost all the prayers and readings of the pulpit! How seldom is a psalm of David read in a pæan-like tone! Dr. Mason used often to read a psalm in that tone; and it is remembered to this day quite as much as his preaching.

Let not innovation be dreaded as if it were destruction. There is no due sense of the honor, dignity, power, beauty, and everlasting vitality of religion, in the timid and obstinate protest against all change, as if it threatened to bring down the fabric of religion, and of the civil order too, upon our heads. There is no such danger. But there is danger in rigid and inflexible usage, danger lest the living letters of ever-changing truth settle into leaden stereotype, and never print any thing but the dogmas of superstition and the worn-out traces of dead custom.

The writer of the preceding pages has not made use of the pronoun *we*. For though the readers of this journal are well aware that all the opinions to which it may give expression are not to be taken with an editorial indorsement, it may be well in the treatment of some themes to avoid all misconstruction. The opinion of an individual has been here expressed.

O. D.

ART. II.—MASSACHUSETTS SANITARY SURVEY.*

THAT the best physical development of a community is a subject within the reach of legislative enactments, the "Report" before us abundantly proves. Nor is legislation on this subject a novelty. The sanitary laws in the Jewish code, touching uncleanness and purification, the allowance of certain meats only at specified seasons, and the prohibition at all times of certain others, were wise then, and are still much observed in Syria. The Spartan youth were trained for the severest athletic exercises by rigorous sobriety. Plato and Aristotle advocate health offices; and we are told, that Epaminondas, Demosthenes, and Plutarch served in those institutions. The Romans were yet more enlightened and efficient legislators on this subject. The *Cloaca Maxima* of the two Tar-

* *Report of a General Plan for the Promotion of Public and Personal Health, devised, prepared, and recommended by the Commissioners appointed under a Resolve of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relating to a Sanitary Survey of the State.* Presented April 25, 1850. Boston. 1850. 8vo pp. 544.

quins still serves as the great sewer of Rome; and the remains of the aqueducts show how vast were the supplies of pure water brought to the capital for its public baths and private dwellings. In Western Europe since 1350, when King John the Second established in France the first sanitary survey, other monarchs have occasionally followed the example of this pioneer reformer. In Great Britain very little attention had been given to the subject before 1825; but since then, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, aided by a few others, has aroused both government and people to an interest in the agencies of health and disease, and has thereby conferred durable good on his country and the world; for in the fifteen annual reports which he has published is wrought out this conclusion, — that *one fourth of all the pauperism in England and Wales is the result of preventable disease.*

Our own journal invited attention to this subject in 1843, in an article from the pen of Dr. Edward Jarvis, of Dorchester, a veteran in this department of philanthropy, whose efforts since 1830 have been unwearied and successful. His Boylston Prize Dissertation, written in 1845, on "The Influence of Climate on Longevity," his able paper read before the American Statistical Association in 1847, another read before the Medical Society in 1848, together with his Annual Address before the same Society in 1849, upon "The Production of Vital Force," — these, with several other contributions to periodicals, have led to a series of applications to the Legislature, which were finally successful, and resulted in the appointment of the "Commission" whose labors we are now reviewing. In October, 1849, the Commission requested the councillors of the Massachusetts Medical Society to furnish them with any suggestions they might deem useful on the subject of a sanitary survey of the State, and on the best plan to be pursued, and with facts which might illustrate the subject. Dr. Jarvis was selected as the member best able to reply to this important request; and on page 252 of the "Report" begins his invaluable letter, which has hints that might be expanded into a philosophical sanitary treatise.

"Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas."

To gather reliable information on these topics from

other countries,—to ascertain the state of disease, and the moral and physical causes operating on the health of our people and on the increase of our population,—is a work worthy of all praise; and no one could have been more industrious or faithful in such an enterprise than Mr. Shattuck, who is the author of the “Report” under consideration. This gentleman, having collected a large sanitary library, and devoted himself for years to the work of gathering statistics of health and disease, of population and immigration, is eminently well qualified to give the best information, and to recommend the wisest measures. His writings on these subjects are very valuable. His method of taking the census and statistics of Boston, in 1845, has been adopted by other cities, and substantially by the United States for the census of 1850. Wherever called to labor in this difficult work, he has proved himself equal to the demand; and the “Report” alone would warrant this eulogy. We must thank the Commission for one of the most learned, accurate, and philosophical papers which our day has produced.

We fully accord with a London writer when he says,—“The discoveries in astronomy have not a more palpable application to navigation and commerce, nor the investigations in chemistry to manufactures, than have the statistics of health and disease to physical and moral regeneration.” The book before us, therefore, has a personal interest to every individual who wishes to live long and enjoy much. Its great purpose is to prove that man, in his physical and sanitary and social condition, is capable of a development far beyond what has been attained. The Commissioners say:—

“WE BELIEVE that the conditions of perfect health, either public or personal, are seldom or never attained, though attainable;—that the average length of human life may be very much extended, and its physical power greatly augmented;—that in every year, within this Commonwealth, thousands of lives are lost which might have been saved;—that tens of thousands of cases of sickness occur, which might have been prevented;—that a vast amount of unnecessarily impaired health and physical debility exists among those not actually confined by sickness;—that these preventable evils require an enormous expenditure and loss of money, and impose upon the people unnumbered and immeasurable calamities, pecuniary, social, physical, mental, and moral,

which might be avoided ; — that means exist, within our reach, for their mitigation or removal ; — and that measures for prevention will effect infinitely more than remedies for the cure of disease.” — p. 10.

Convinced that good, every way, must result from the investigation of this subject, the Legislature of Massachusetts, in May, 1849, passed a resolve authorizing the Governor to appoint three persons as Commissioners to prepare a plan for a sanitary survey of the State. Messrs. Lemuel Shattuck of Boston, Nathaniel P. Banks, Jr. of Waltham, and Jehiel Abbott of Westfield, were selected, and the work has been accomplished by the Chairman, approved by his colleagues, accepted by the government, and distributed by authority.

The contents of the volume are thus divided : — I. Sanitary Movement Abroad. II. Sanitary Movement at Home. III. Plan for a Sanitary Survey of the State. IV. Reasons for approving the Plan recommended. V. Objections answered. VI. Closing Appeal. VII. Bill recommended for Enactment. VIII. Appendix of Legislative, Medical, Scientific, Municipal, and Economical Documents.

With a completeness of plan, a collection of materials, an analysis of facts, an arrangement of proofs, and a caution of inference truly remarkable, the author has demonstrated that great sanitary evils now exist, that these evils are removable, and that no real and permanent improvement can ensue until they are removed. He does not regard questions concerning census, population, immigration, births, marriages, and deaths, as matters of curiosity, but as great philosophical truths, on which human elevation must be, in a great measure, based, and out of which individual and social progress may be educated.

As a specimen of the mode of proof adopted by the Commission, we will quote a few items deduced from the official documents of England, embracing results from a vast range of governmental investigations. These documents prove, that

“ There die annually, in each 100 of the population, of the whole of England, 2.27 ; of the most healthy district, 1.53 ; and of the most unhealthy district, 3.58. And that the living to one death are, in these districts, respectively, 44, 65, and 27.” — p. 46.

"It is proved that disease and mortality fall more heavily upon those who live in large towns and populous places, than in the country districts, and particularly upon those who live in narrow streets, confined courts, damp dwellings, close chambers, cellars, undrained, unventilated, and uncleansed; and affect most severely the infantile portion of the population, and the heads of families between twenty and thirty years of age." — p. 47.

"It is proved that the annual mortality might be reduced, in the whole kingdom, from 2.27 per cent., or 1 in 44, to less than two per cent., or 1 in 50; and in all large towns, as low as that general average.

"It is proved that this unnecessary excess of mortality above 2 per cent. occasions an annual loss of more than 50,000 lives in the United Kingdom.

"It is proved that, of the 43,000 cases of widowhood, and 112,000 cases of destitute orphanage, relieved from the poor rates of England and Wales alone, the greater proportion of deaths of the heads of families occurred from specified removable causes.

"It is proved that the younger population, bred up under noxious physical agencies, is inferior in physical organization and general health to a population preserved from such agencies; and that these adverse circumstances tend to produce an adult population, short-lived, improvident, reckless, intemperate, immoral, and with excessive desires for sensual gratifications." — pp. 47, 48.

It is proved that in London "there are about 266 deaths every week, nearly 38 deaths a day, or considerably more than one every hour, *over and above* what ought to happen in the common course of nature. Now, it has been calculated that, for every death which takes place, there are 28 cases of sickness which do not end fatally. We have, therefore, 387,296 cases of sickness occurring in the metropolis every year, which are unnecessary and preventible. 13,832 lives could be saved,—more than a third of a million of cases of sickness could be prevented." — p. 280.

Thus "infancy is made stunted, ugly, and full of pains,—maturity made old,—and old age imbecile; and pauperism made hopeless every day." — *Ibid.*

Do not proofs like these, gathered from every part of Europe, speak with prophetic emphasis to the people of these United States?

Let us glance at some proofs found in our own history, premising, however, that most of the epidemics recorded in the early history of Massachusetts might have

been relieved of their fatal character, to a very great extent, by the sanitary precautions which modern science and present experience suggest.

In 1678 small-pox prevailed in Boston; "seven or eight hundred are said to have died of it in the State. About this time 'the seasons were unfavorable, and the fruits blasted, while malignant diseases prevailed among the people. The sickness and bad seasons were attributed by our pious ancestors to the irreligion of the times, and to their disuse of fasting; and a meeting was held to investigate the causes of God's judgments, and to propose a plan of reformation.'" — p. 63.

1678. The selectmen of Salem "ordered, that William Stacy, who is sick of the small-pox, doth not presume to come abroad till three weeks after this date; and that he be careful that when the time be expired he shift his clothes, and do not frequent company till he be wholly clear of the infection."

"1721. The small-pox again made its appearance in Boston, with more than its usual ravages and horrors, and was the occasion of one of the most remarkable and important events in the sanitary history of the State. *Inoculation with the virus of small-pox*, as a substitute for the disease taken in a natural way, — to disarm it of its malignity, and to reduce it to comparative mildness and safety, — was first introduced this year. Rev. Dr. Cotton Mather, having read, in the transactions of the Royal Society of London, favorable accounts of the operation, recommended a trial of it to the physicians of Boston; but all of them unanimously and decidedly opposed it, excepting Dr. Zabdiel Boylston. That enlightened and upright man became forcibly impressed with the importance of the discovery; and, to show his confidence in it, made the first experiment on his own son, thirteen years of age, and two colored persons in his family, one two, and the other thirty-six years old; and all with complete success. Subsequently, others were inoculated.

"The controversies which accompanied the introduction of this useful measure were most disreputable. Many persons were struck with horror; some thought it was sinning against God, thus to interfere with the disease; and others, that, if any patients died, Dr. Boylston [who began the practice of inoculation] ought to be treated as a murderer. Pamphlets and newspaper articles frequently appeared; and the populace, chiefly led on by the inflammatory conduct of the physicians, at the head of whom was Dr. Douglass, became so exceedingly enraged, that Dr. Boylston was frequently insulted in the streets, and forced to secrete himself for more than fourteen days, and afterwards to visit his patients only at midnight." — pp. 64, 65.

As a specimen of the bitterness engendered by the controversy on *inoculation*, we quote the following grave conclusion of that same Dr. Douglass, in 1753. "In general," he says, "the physical practice in our Colonies is so perniciously bad, that, excepting in surgery, and some very acute cases, it is better to let nature, under a proper regimen, take her course, than to trust to the honesty and sagacity of the practitioner: our American practitioners are so rash and officious, the saying in the Apocrypha (Ecclesiasticus xxxviii. 15) may with much propriety be applied to them, — '*He that sinneth before his Maker, let him fall into the hands of the physician!*'" Frequently, there is more danger from the physician than from the distemper."

"1763. 'In August, the Indians on Nantucket were attacked by a bilious plague; and, between that time and the February following, their number was reduced from 358 to 136. Of 258 who were affected, 36 only recovered.' The Indians on Martha's Vineyard suffered from the same fever. Not a family escaped. Of 52 attacked, 39 died. It was confined in both places to the Indians, and none but those of full-blood died!" — p. 68.

"1796. In Boston a very malignant typhus appeared on the 25th of August; and between that time and December many were sick, and thirty died. It created great alarm; some were buried in the night. Dr. John Warren, who wrote an account of it, says that the physicians were unanimous in the opinion that it originated from local causes. 'A very great portion of those taken sick were situated near extensive flats, particularly about the easterly, southeasterly, and westerly skirts of the town.'

"In this year, also, a very malignant dysentery and bilious fever appeared in Sheffield. It was confined principally to a section of the town not over one and a half miles in diameter, — in the vicinity of a pond known as Hubbard's Pond, — containing about 100 families, or 600 inhabitants. Of these, over 300 were sick, and 44 died, 12 adults and 32 children. Among 150 who lived near the pond, on the southeasterly side, less than 10 escaped. Of those on the westerly side, about 50 were affected.

"The cause of this remarkable sickness, and others of similar character, which that town suffered in other years, was attributed to this pond. A dam was built at the outlet, and, at times of high water, a large tract of land was overflowed. In dry seasons the water was drawn off, and large quantities of decomposing vegetable matter were exposed to the action of the sun,

which produced a poisonous exhalation, or *malaria*, which affected nearly all who inhaled it." — pp. 71, 72.

In the famous "Mill-dam case" tried in Litchfield, Connecticut, in January, 1800, where the question was, whether the building of a dam had caused the extraordinary sickness of the inhabitants, the report of the trial contains the following statement: —

"It was generally agreed by the medical gentlemen, that the bilious remitting fever and fever and ague of our country are produced by marsh effluvia; that this effluvia is caused by animal and vegetable putrefaction; that the action of the sun on vegetables or animals, upon the receding of waters from them, frequently causes this putrefaction; and that the months of July and August are seasons peculiarly favorable for the production of this effluvia, and its operation upon the human constitution. It was also agreed that water, though stagnant, does not become dangerous till it is so fetid as to offend the senses; and that while vegetables and animals are covered with running water they are innoxious." — p. 74.

Dr. Holmes, in his prize essay, says: —

"Mill-dams on the Housatonic and its tributary streams, by forcing the water, for miles above their location, into low grounds, marshes, and coves, and thereby producing macerating reservoirs of vegetable substance, produce foci of pestiferous exhalations, to which intermittents, in all their grades and varieties, have been obviously traceable." — p. 75.

"1815-16. This winter a typhus fever of peculiar malignity appeared. . . . In Attleborough, more than one hundred died of this disease in three months. In Rochester, fifty died. 'It is stated, as a fact, that this epidemic followed the course of rivers, tracing up the Accushnet and Mattapoiset, to the great pond in Freetown, and extending but very little beyond the meeting-house in Rochester, which has ever been one of the most healthy spots in New England, and where it is dry and sandy. Dr. Mann states, that scarce a person escaped this fever, who lived within a mile of the great pond in Sharon, where it prevailed so fatally. Six persons, of the family of Ashley, died of this fever in one house, situate near the great pond in Freetown.'" — p. 78.

Mr. Shattuck gives a table, compiled with great care, showing accurately a general view of the influences on human life and longevity, as existing in the State. It takes Boston, and exhibits the rate of mortality among its inhabitants at three different periods, and also among

those of an interior town whose average health has been ascertained. It will be found on page 82. The result is thus stated:—

“ For all ages, the average rate of mortality for the last nine years, in Boston, was 2.53 per cent., or 1 in 39 of the whole population. In the country towns, in 1830, it was 1.49 per cent., or 1 in 67. In Boston, of those under five years of age, 9 out of every 100 died; while in the country, 3.05 only, or about one third as many, of the same age, died. At other ages, also, a great difference may be seen between the rate of mortality in the city and country, and between one period and another. A comparison of the table with that of England (p. 34) will show a very near agreement of the health of our country towns with that of the most healthy districts in England, and of Boston with London.”— p. 83.

We wish we could extract the table showing the action of the *seasons* upon health. It proves, among other things, that August and September are the most unhealthy months in the city, and October in the country.

The influence of *occupation* on health and longevity is very great, and our clerical readers may be interested in the following table.

“ Of the *clergymen* who lived and died in Massachusetts, prior to 1825, the ages of 888 have been ascertained. Divided into periods, according to the time of their decease, the following is the result:—

		Aggregate Ages.	Average Age.
90	who died prior to 1700	had 5,560 years.	61.77 years.
123	“ 1700 to 1750	“ 7,996 “	65.00 “
303	“ 1750 to 1800	“ 18,957 “	62.55 “
372	“ 1800 to 1825	“ 23,986 “	64.47 “
888	Totals,	56,499 “	63.62 “

“ The Quarterly Register (Vol. X. p. 39) gives the aggregate ages of 840 clergymen, who graduated at Harvard University, and died prior to 1835, at 53,447 years; 63.62 years being the average age: 41 in each 100 attained the age of 70. This corresponds very nearly with the preceding statement; 62½ years may be considered as the average age of clergymen, in this State, during the last century, and prior to 1825. In the quarterly lists of deaths of clergymen, as given in the fifteen volumes of the Register, prior to 1841, the ages of 147 in Massachusetts are stated, amounting in the aggregate to 8,642,—averaging 58.79; and of 167 in other New England States, amounting in

the aggregate to 9,423, — averaging 56.42. The average age of 114, who died in the period covered by the Registration Reports, is given below, at 56.64 years. This shows an average decline in the longevity of clergymen of seven years." — p. 85.

We wish we had room to extract the valuable tables on "fatal diseases and causes of death," because the influence of disease is the surest test of the sanitary condition of a community. The pathologist and legislator may study these tables with vast profit. Under the head of Zymotic (i. e. epidemic, endemic, and contagious) Diseases, the conclusion is arrived at, that "these causes of death have doubled in the city (of Boston) within the last thirty years, and that the public health has been constantly growing worse." In the rural districts, the melancholy fact stands nearly the same.

With regard to *consumption*, which destroys from one seventh to one fourth of all who die, some singular facts are stated. It appears that the seasons do not exercise that controlling power over this disease which has been supposed. In Massachusetts, New York, and London the smallest number die in November.

"At the ages 20 to 30, the number of females who die of consumption is nearly double that of the males, — being 1,409 of the former to 708 of the latter. At the ages 30 to 40, the next in the number of its victims, it also selects from the sexes in nearly the same proportion." — p. 96.

In Massachusetts, in four years, 3,443 males and 5,384 females have died of this disease. In England, in one year, 24,048 males, and 28,088 females.

The chief aim should be to *resist the incipient stages*; for if consumption is ever to be eradicated or lessened among us, it must be done by prevention, and not by cure.

From these tables of death's doings may be detected those great laws which underlie all human society. Among other truths, they show the vast difference in the longevity of persons living in different localities; they show that similar causes exist in England and Massachusetts to produce, not only unnecessary and preventable sickness, but premature and preventable death; they show, moreover, that the active causes of debility are increasing among us of New England, and that the average du-

ration of human life is somewhat less than it was fifty years ago.

Having looked at the subject from an historical point of view, and suggested the means of preventing disease; and, furthermore, having drawn conclusions warranted by well-authenticated tables of statistics, the Commission proceed to the third division of their labors, which is, to propose a plan for the sanitary survey of the State. The propositions constituting the plan are drawn up with vast care and great good sense, and must commend themselves to every intelligent citizen. The measures embrace two classes of action;—one through the legislative authority of the State and the municipal authority of the towns and cities, and the other by social organization and personal effort.

Under the head of the State and municipal measures, which may be called the *Sanitary Police* of the Commonwealth, the Commissioners recommend, first, a revision of the laws relating to health. They have accordingly presented to the Legislature a draft of an act whose passage they recommend. The careful examination of this act must convince any one that these public agents have sounded the depths and shoals of the subject; and we trust the bill, in its main features, will soon become the permanent law of the State.

Among the remedial agencies proposed for the great sanitary evils which afflict us, and which threaten increasing devastation, is the establishment of a **GENERAL BOARD OF HEALTH**, to act as a central power for the whole State; and also a *Local Board of Health* for each town. The Commissioners recommend that this General Board consist of two physicians, one lawyer, one chemist, one civil engineer, and two other persons particularly skillful in sanitary science. To these are to be added a Secretary, who shall perform for the board what the Secretary of the Board of Education performs for that body.

We apprehend that such a board would be able, after a few years, to expound accurately the laws of health and life as they operate among us; to ascertain the causes of disease and the best modes of dealing with them; to explain the vital force and productive power of human life, and thereby to show how physical strength,

individual happiness, and social improvement may be secured. As old age is the only disease *natural* to man, it is quite time that these topics had arrested parental and legislative attention.

We have no space to speak of the *Local Boards*, although we see that they must be the right hand of the whole system. They will be to the plan what the wheels of a machine are to its motive power.

Nor have we space for the fifty "recommendations" touching the proposed survey. Two or three specimens must suffice. The Commissioners speak of the importance of ascertaining the causes of disease, and in order to secure intelligible descriptions they recommend a uniform nomenclature; and, moreover, they would classify the causes of disease into, I. *Atmospheric*; II. *Local*; and, III. *Personal*. They recommend certain arrangements in laying out new towns, in constructing school-houses, hotels, hospitals, manufactories, and public buildings, providing for the supply of soft water, for ventilation, and for cleanliness. They recommend that the local boards ascertain the amount of sickness suffered in different localities, and among persons of different classes, sexes, ages, and professions. They recommend rules with regard to cemeteries, and the burial of the dead; also, with regard to evils brought upon us by foreign immigration; also, with respect to the sale of quack medicines and adulterated food. Among the last items of advice is this;—that parents should understand the principles of health, and should make it a paramount duty to secure to their young children a sound physical development. We remember the last lecture delivered by Dr. Spurzheim, and in it he made this remark:—"Let the first seven years of every child's life be devoted to the natural unfolding of his physical powers, because this will lay the foundation for sound health through the whole succeeding life."

As specimens of the special sanitary survey of particular places, recommended by the Commissioners, we would mention those of Attleborough and Lynn. They are perfect in their way.

The reasons for approving the plan proposed are next brought forward, and then the objections which have been imagined. Of these objections there seem to

us but two which have even the show of force. The first is, "It will alarm the people." Well, what if it should? We hope it will alarm every man, woman, and child in the Commonwealth, and then we shall begin to look for some efficient action in the matter. The other is this,— "It will interfere with Divine Providence." Some, doubtless, will say, when sickness comes, "It was so ordered, and so it must be." This old doctrine of fate is kept young by the ignorance of mankind. It would be of small use to say to this class of objectors, that the forces of life on which health and longevity depend are as fixed as the laws of gravitation, and, like those laws, can be used by us for our safety or destruction. They have no eye to see the fact, that like causes in this department must produce like effects, as certainly as light, heat, and moisture produce vegetation, while darkness, frost, and drought prevent it. We might tell them, that, to be consistent with themselves, they should not plant in spring, nor send for a physician when they are sick, because all such use of means implies distrust of the Divine care. But let us rejoice that light is breaking in over the old boundaries of hereditary ignorance, and that the masses are coming to think with Fontaine,— "Aide-toi, le ciel t'aidera,"— *Help yourself, and God will help you.* We like Dr. Chalmers's maxim,— "Man should trust in God as if God did all, and labor himself as if man did all."

We must accord our unqualified approbation to recent legislative acts on this great subject, believing them to be the commencement of a new and glorious work. Massachusetts takes the lead in this enterprise, and she has struck properly the grand key-note. If the plan be prosecuted with intelligence and zeal, it will mark a memorable red-letter day in the history of the Commonwealth.

The establishment of a central board of health for the State, and a local board for each city and town, would bring to light, not only the causes of disease and the means of prevention, but would also help to extend life to its natural period by removing the influences which artificially curtail it. That the requisite knowledge for these merciful results can be attained by all, there is no doubt. The following question was proposed to several distinguished physicians:—

“How great a proportion of disease, of suffering, of diminution of physical capacity, of usefulness, and of abridgment of life, comes from sheer ignorance, and which, therefore, we might hope to see averted, if the community had that degree of knowledge which is easily attainable by all?”

“To this question Dr. James Jackson, of Boston, replies, — ‘I feel assured that the answer should be, *More than one half*. When it is brought to mind that the ignorance of parents is included in the terms of the inquiry, the justice of the answer will probably be admitted by all who are conversant with the subject.’

“Dr. S. B. Woodward, late superintendent of the State Lunatic Hospital, says, — ‘I have no doubt that *half* of the evils of life, and *half* the deaths that occur among mankind, arise from ignorance of the laws of health and life; and that a thorough knowledge of these laws would diminish the sufferings incident to our present state of being in very nearly the same proportion.’

“Dr. Edward Jarvis replies, — ‘From an observation of thirteen years, I have been led to believe that *three fourths, perhaps more*, of the ailments of men come from a want of sufficient knowledge of their frame, or a disregard for it.’” — p. 251.

What positive and increasing utility must result from the system proposed! How would it spread before the people and the Legislature the facts on which sanitary laws should be based! How would it be as a physician in every family, devising, not remedies, but preventives! And would not economy be another consequence of the measure? Sickness and debility, widowhood and orphanage, are expensive. How often are they connected with pauperism! Lord Ashley, the best judge in England of this matter, said, in a recent speech at London,—

“At least one third of the pauperism of the country arose from the defective sanitary condition of large multitudes of the people; and he had no hesitation in saying, upon the authority of experienced persons, that, if the population of their great towns were placed under proper sanitary regulations, in less than ten years the poor rates would be reduced £2,000,000 annually.” — pp. 255, 256.

Similar statements might be made of the United States; for we are sure that the bringing of the facts of a sanitary survey of the State before the people would be an all-important preliminary to their better health, more efficient labor, and social happiness. If Massachusetts appropriates \$ 850,000 annually for the education of chil-

dren's *minds*, would it not be wise to make some provision for the normal vigor of the *bodies* in which these minds are to labor? If the body be the house the mind lives in, would it not be wise to keep it in such good order that it would not need repairs until the tenant was ready to move out?

We maintain that the plan proposed by the Commission is a *moral* one.

“ ‘There is a most fatal and certain connection,’ says the Edinburgh Review, ‘between physical uncleanness and moral pollution. The condition of a population becomes invariably assimilated to that of their habitations. There can be no sight more painful than that of a healthy, rosy, active countrywoman brought to one of these dwellings. For a time there is a desperate exertion to keep the place clean; several times in the forenoon is the pavement in the front of the house washed, but as often does the oozing filth creep along the stones, and she feels, at length, that her labor is in vain. The noxious exhalations infuse their poison into her system, and her energies droop. Then she becomes sick. Cleanliness becoming impossible, she gets accustomed to its absence, and gradually sinks into the ways of her neighbors. The art of concealing dirt is substituted for the habit of cleanliness; she becomes a dirty, debilitated slattern, followed by sickly, scrofulous, feverish children; and she falls through successive stages of degradation, till, physical wretchedness having done its worst, she reaches the lowest of all, that in which she has ceased to complain. The fate of the children is, if possible, more heart-breaking. All idea of sobriety, all notion of self-respect, all sense of modesty, all instinct of decency, is nipped in the bud; they congregate in masses, and mix with the worst vagrants. At last some dreadful fever forces on the notice of the public the existence of their squalid dens of misery; such as those in the Saffron Hill district, — where twenty-five people were found living in a room sixteen feet square, — where a man and his wife and four children, occupying one room, took in seven lodgers, — and where one house contained a hundred and twenty-six people, and only six or seven beds. These people save nothing, but invariably spend all they earn in drink; and with that precocious depravity too surely evinced by human beings when herded together like beasts, the young of both sexes live together from the ages of twelve and thirteen years.’ ” — pp. 266, 267.

Who' would not do something to save the rising generations in our republic? Nothing can be truer than the remark, that “you cannot degrade the physical man by

a life-long familiarity with scenes of filth and indecency, without debasing his whole moral nature." Let us put an end to this moral pestilence, and bid the destroying angel stay his hand. Let jails and sheriffs give place to churches and Sunday-school teachers, and the Sabbath become a festival of plenty and peace.

Mr. Chambers recently said,—

"Of all the great undertakings by which the era is signalized, there is perhaps none which so clearly stamps a character of real and essential progress as the Sanitary Movement; for the result of this, mediate and immediate, is a positive, a cumulative good; a social, moral, and intellectual amelioration of a most beneficial nature,—one which we believe is destined to effect great results in the material advancement of a people. Its ultimate effect, whether so intended or not, lies beyond the pecuniary advantage,—the dollars and cents; it recognizes the existence of claims and sympathies,—intimate relations between all phases and grades of society."— p. 276.

If the Divine Lawgiver thought fit to proclaim sanitary laws, by his servant Moses, to his chosen people, can human governments do better than to follow his example, and, by laws fitted to our age and condition, develop human energies, prevent human suffering, and secure human improvement? In regard to the whole range of the laws of health and life, Providence seems to treat mere ignorance as an offence, and to punish it accordingly.

Now, with an annual report before us, we say emphatically, that the main conditions which constitute the unhealthiness of towns are definite, palpable, removable evils. We aver, that the dense over-crowding of a population, the intricate ramification of courts and alleys, excluding light and air, the defective drainage, the products of organic decomposition, the contaminated water, and the more contaminated atmosphere, are distinct causes of disease and death. We further affirm, that each of these destructive agencies admits of being definitely estimated in its numerical proportion to the total mortality which it contributes to cause, and that each is susceptible of abatement or removal, which will at once be followed by diminution of its alleged effects on the health of our American population.

In view of the whole subject, we invite every sober

mind and every feeling heart to examine the laws of physical growth and normal life. How much may depend upon our knowing the hygienic resources and influences of the region wherein our lot is cast, ascertaining the amount of vitality and usable force within our reach, and learning the cause of differences in different localities! It is possible for us to determine these questions as they relate to country and sea-coast, to mountains and valleys, to dry places and wet, to cities and forests, to high houses and low, to crowded population and sparse; and, moreover, to varying human pursuits, whether they be those of the sailor or soldier, the merchant or mechanic, the farmer or physician, the queen or her laundry-woman. The facts concerning all these great interests of health and longevity, disease and death, can be ascertained almost with mathematical accuracy. There are certain immutable laws, and there can be no accident in their results. Cause and effect are the same here as in sowing and reaping. "There is no more caprice or mystery in the flow and ebb of life, in the maintenance of health, in the cause of sickness or in the event of death, than there is in the flow and the ebb of the tides, in the movements of the stars, or in the action of gravitation." (p. 354.)

It being proved, then, that just so far as normal vitalizing forces act on man, so far his health, strength, and longevity will be promoted, and that just so far as destructive forces act on him, so far debility, sickness, and death ensue, what should these two following facts teach us? The number of deaths in Massachusetts, from consumption, during 1845, 1846, 1847, and 1848, was 57 per cent. greater among females than among males! In New York, during 1847 and 1848, it was 37 per cent.! Is it not worth while to inquire into the causes of such disparities, and to ascertain how human life may be saved? A sanitary survey would embrace every feature of deterioration arising from age, sex, condition, pursuit, locality, or circumstance. The most enlightened governments of Europe are prosecuting the subject with true science and Christian policy. We have an American motive for doing it; that we may prevent the spread of those hereditary diseases, which are now cursing some parts of Southern Europe with a race of dwarfs and fools.

Less than we have said would be enough to show how this whole subject appeals to physicians. We see the entire medical profession earnestly engaged in conflict with physical ills. They know how often men dig their graves with their teeth; they often see verified the Spanish maxim, "A rich mouthful and a heavy groan"; and they can tell when the best physicians are Dr. Diet, Dr. Quiet, and Dr. Merryman. If they, who are so well acquainted with the science of cure, would give themselves heartily to the science of prevention, they would lay the community under boundless obligations to them.

It appeals to Christian ministers. How often does the minister, in his visits to the sick, discover the causes of an illness which might have been prevented; and, if he be a well-instructed physiologist, how often can he impart the knowledge which would give an entirely new direction to the habits of a family.

It appeals to the educated. They, of either sex, who make a study of sanitary science, may do, by their pens or eloquence, a good to society in general, and to the poor in particular, which numbers cannot compute. Lord Morpeth said in his address, — "No one's conscience, be they ministers of state, be they members of Parliament, be they members of corporations, or be they citizens of any class, ought to hold themselves harmless, if in time coming they offer any obstruction, or suffer any obstruction to be offered, to the immediate adoption of sanitary reform."*

It appeals to the wealthy and philanthropic. In few ways could the rich and compassionate bestow their money or service to more permanent benefit, than by devising and establishing those sanitary agencies which prevent disease and suffering, pauperism and crime.

It appeals to the people. It addresses each person in the community, and bears equally upon individual and collective interests. It seeks no subversion of any social, political, or religious institutions, nor the abrogation of any constitutional statute; but it does come with its advice and caution to every human being, wishing to make every one more healthy, more useful, and more happy.

It appeals to towns. The great efficacy of health

* Journal of Public Health, Vol. I. p. 23.

regulations must depend on municipal authorities. If the local boards do their duty, the reform is safe; if they refuse, it must stop.

“Cholera, typhus, consumption, and other diseases, are health inspectors, that speak in language which none can misunderstand; they visit persons on polluted rivers, the neglected lunatic in his cell, the crowded workshop, the establishments for pauper children, the sides of stagnant sewers, the undrained city, the uncleaned street, the cellar and the attic, as well as the fair open quarters which strangers frequent and admire. The oversights, the errors, the crimes of persons who in responsible offices have charge of the health and life of men, are proclaimed aloud by their inexorable voices.”— pp. 303, 304.

It appeals to the State. If every inhabitant be entitled to protection in life and property, may not health be included in the purposes of legislation? A state is bound to develop all its resources, and should not mind and muscles be the first in the series of agencies? What greater wisdom can a state show, than to cherish and protect the forces of human life, *on which all other prosperity depends*? If Massachusetts can give her money to help found an asylum for the deaf and dumb in a neighboring State, and if within her own borders she opens one retreat for the insane, and another for the blind, and then establishes the first State Reform School; if she dots her whole territory with school-houses which stand “like sparkling diamonds in the sky” to give light and hope to every child; and if she spends \$ 830,577 next year, as she did last, to support her schools, may she not awake to the great interests of health, strength, and longevity, of sickness, poverty, and death, among her citizens? She has been called “the moral Commonwealth,” “the enlightened State,” and will she not take the lead in an efficient and comprehensive plan of sanitary reform?

There are several grave questions which want of space compels us to pass over, but we cannot omit saying a word about houses occupied by the poor. They who have devoted time and intelligence to the examination of this subject have satisfactorily shown, that not only common policy, but humanity and religion, demand that the poor should be protected against the pestiferous filth, the corrupting associations and loathsome habits, which

their wretched tenements inevitably produce. Dr. Jarvis says, —

“There is a very common notion, that the privation and discomforts of poverty are at least compensated by health. The robust strength of the laborer is often referred to as an example of this compensation. The children, especially of the poor, who are often neglected and uncleanly, in want of proper clothing, and exposed to the severity of the elements, are quoted as proofs of the uselessness of attending to many of the rules of health. But all inquiry into the condition and health of the poor shows the fallacy of these opinions, and the evil consequences of following them.” — p. 357.

Bath-houses should be erected for the gratuitous use of all who cannot elsewhere find the proper supply of water. Happy are they who can bathe daily; but we can hardly think of that person as a Christian, who does not bring his whole person into contact with water at least once every week. Statistics from every quarter of the globe prove, that frequent bathing in pure water prevents sickness; and in doing this it prevents suffering and poverty. If this be so, are we not morally bound to furnish these defences to those who cannot afford to purchase them? It was an old Roman maxim, “The morning to the mountain, the evening to the fountain.”

And as to the health of school-children, we would suggest to those who live in cities and crowded towns the purchase of a farm where boys from six to sixteen years can go each year, during three or four months, to perform agricultural labor and enjoy rural sports. Such an establishment, under stringent, parental regulation, would do more for the health, energy, and improvement of feeble children, than all the powers of common therapeutics.

We would commend this “Report,” and especially the subject of sanitary science, to every person who wishes to make the most of himself while he lives in this world; and when we consider the hereditary transmission of disease, the subject assumes a moral and religious aspect at once momentous and prophetic.

C. B.

ART. III.—"HE DESCENDED INTO HELL."

THIS is the beginning of the fifth article of what is called the Apostles' Creed. The Creed, though quite ancient, has no manner of title to the name it bears. The parts of which it is composed were brought together from uncertain hands, and at long intervals of time. It did not take its present shape till the Christian Church had long been immersed in those corrupt and deplorable days which followed its political ascendancy under Constantine, and its distracted dogmatism after the Council of Nice. Its profession of belief in the "communion of saints" was not introduced till after that communion had become very much like a chaos of disputes, and many an abominable transaction had so stained the pages of ecclesiastical history, as to lead us to think that there could be few real saints left. That article was, in fact, brought in, like several of the rest, to meet a controversial exigency. It was occasioned by the schism of the Donatists; a poor faction of ecclesiastics in Africa, who did not disagree with their Christian brethren in any point of doctrine, but, from a cause as local as their climate, fell out with all the rest, set up to be the only true Church, and were fain to excommunicate every thing that lay on the other side of the Mediterranean Sea. It meant well, then, and may be construed into something really excellent. The article also that precedes it, but which is the last of all in some ancient creeds,—Cyprian's, for example,—owes its phraseology to a similar cause. Dissension led to the profession, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." The word "Catholic" was not at first there. No reason existed why it should be there. It was suggested by after discords. The Greeks were the first to insert it, and it was received from them and adopted by the Latins. It is a good word; of the most comprehensive breadth, and full of charity. It signifies universal. It opposes every idea of what is exclusive. To our Protestant ears it may convey the thought of the most monstrous of spiritual usurpations, the Papal. Most unjustly; unless we connect it with the word "Roman." But the very phrase "Roman Catholic" is a solecism in language. It expresses

things so contradictory that they cannot stand together. One of the terms is local, the name of a place. The other nobly disregards all bounds of domain and peculiarities of opinion. Catholic, or "general," is the title given to the Epistles of Peter and John, James and Jude, because they were not directed, like those of Paul, to Rome, or Corinth, or Thessalonica, or any other special communion, but to the believers who were scattered over the whole earth, wheresoever and whomsoever. The article, therefore, is to be applauded, though the necessity that called for it was a reproach. The Church had fallen upon evil times; more evil than any before, inasmuch as corruption was worse than distress. Even the grand words "and the life everlasting," with which the Creed, as we now have it, so fitly closes, did not obtain general admission till the new hierarchy seemed wellnigh given over to the ambitious schemes of this world and the worst human passions.

As soon, however, as the Creed became fixed in its form, it was universally held in the highest estimation, which it has retained down to the present day. And it deserves the distinguished favor that it has acquired. For, though far enough from being traceable to the Apostles, it is the shortest, simplest, and most comprehensive confession of faith known to the churches. It is beautiful for its compactness; beautiful for that degree of antiquity and sacred usage which throw the charm of their associations around it; beautiful for its freedom from abstruse theology; beautiful for the solemn flow of its Scripture-like language. It has entered into the liturgies of the East and the West. Wherever a creed is publicly recited, this is it, or by the side of it. It appears the more excellent from its contrast to the Athanasian, or even the Nicene Creed. The latter of these, the Nicene, with its controversial metaphysics, is sometimes read in the services of the Episcopal Church of the United States. The former, the Athanasian, still disgraces the English Book of Common Prayer, and is required to be occasionally repeated by the minister and congregation. We may be allowed to doubt whether it most affronts human reason by its wordy absurdities, or insults humanity itself by the denunciation with which it opens and ends and is interspersed, — "which faith except every

one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly."

Thus much we have been moved to say in praise of the Apostles' Creed, though it comes to us with a pretension that it cannot justify, though its "communion of saints" is no very distinct article of belief, and "the resurrection of the body" must be construed with the largest allowance before it can command the universal assent of the Christian world. But we had not proposed to dwell much on the history or general character of this celebrated confession. Our attention will be occupied at present only with that particular clause of it which we quoted at the outset. "He descended into hell." This is a remarkable one on several accounts. From its ambiguity, it has given occasion to many discussions, especially in the early times, when men's minds kindled more easily at theological phrases than they now do. It carries a strange, mysterious sound with it, that arrests the thought, if it does not shock the feeling, of readers at the present day. The Church itself has become a little shy of it, as is manifest from the permission allowed the officiating minister either to repeat or to omit it in the public service, or to say instead of it, "He went into the place of departed spirits." This permission is, indeed, confined to the Episcopal Church in our own country; but still it is a significant circumstance. It is a solitary instance, we believe, of any liberty taken with the rubric, in a communion that is peculiarly, and perhaps wisely, jealous of the slightest innovations. For these reasons, we have thought that an unpretending dissertation on the subject, free from all learned tediousness or perplexing subtilties, might gratify a reasonable curiosity, and lead to some suggestions both interesting and profitable.

The passage in question does not appear to have found its way into any Catholic creed till late in the fourth century after the birth of the Saviour. Rufinus, who wrote at that period, tells us, in his Exposition of the Symbol, that it had not been added before his time either to the Roman or the Oriental creeds. The occasion of its being then introduced was a polemical one. It was levelled against the doctrine of Apollinarius, a famous bishop of Laodicea, who maintained that Christ

had no proper human soul, but that the place of this was supplied by the Logos or Divine Word. This defection from what was set up as the standard of the true faith, especially when recommended by so eminent a prelate and so popular a writer, gave a shock to the feelings of his contemporaries; and they introduced the article we are speaking of, as a protest and protection against what appeared to them a grievous error. It was certainly an effective method. For none but a human spirit could be supposed to enter into the gathering-place of departed souls; and Christ was thus shown to be a real man, not only in the body that was buried, but in the rational portion of his being. Such, at least, is the account that has been handed down to us as most probable of the circumstances which brought the clause into the Apostles' Creed. Apollinarius—or Apollinaris, as the Latin fathers uniformly name him—was both theologian and poet. He deserved well of the Church, as one of its ablest champions and most beloved servants. He composed learned books, which Jerome pronounces to be innumerable, and sacred verses, that were in the mouths of the commonest people. But by attempting to be particularly orthodox, he fell under the reproach of heresy, amidst a conflict of metaphysical disputes, where the most favorite dogmas contradicted themselves, and where a man could scarcely define one point of the received faith without finding himself in direct collision with other points. Hence it happened that all his works came to perish, excepting a Paraphrase of the Psalms, unless we account as his a tragedy found in the works of Gregory Nazianzen, and called "Christ Suffering," which has been ascribed to him on we know not what authority. The world may be well enough rid of his controversial writings. There are too many of such already,—a rubbish-heap from the contributions of all ages. But we cannot help regretting the loss of those psalms and hymns, which were sung not only in the public assemblies, but by poor men and women at their occupations,—in the workshops and over the distaff.

"He descended into hell." The general meaning of this phrase is not very obscure. Few persons need to be told that the word *hell*, though now used only as designating the abode of the wicked after death, or of the

condemned after the judgment, was originally of a much more comprehensive application. At the time the first English versions of the Bible were made, it corresponded with the Greek Hades, or the Hebrew Scheol, and meant the receptacle of our conscious being after this life has been passed through. Thus, in the old version of the Psalms, which is still retained in the Book of Common Prayer, we read (Ps. lxxxix. 48), "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of hell?" Dr. Towerson, in his Commentary on the Creed, mentions a Saxon discourse, "written above seven hundred years ago," which said of Adam, that after he had lived nine hundred years he went with sorrow into hell, which could not have denoted a place of punishment, for all agreed in the salvation of the first man. King James's translators sometimes employ it in that sense, though more frequently in its restricted signification of a place of punishment. When Jonah says that he cried to the Lord "out of the belly of hell," and when the Psalmist says, "If I make my bed in hell, behold! Thou—". we can understand the term only in its widest acceptation, the under-world. According to the imagery in our Lord's parable of the rich man and Lazarus, it is plain that they went to the same Hades, though one was in torment and the other in bliss. The domain lay in two parts, with an impassable gulf between them. So in the Grecian mythology. Elysium was as much of a descent as Tartarus. They were in the same plane. In other instances, however, the word does not seem to have any reference to the condition of souls at all, but is simply equivalent to the grave, or to the state of the dead, whatever that state may be. When Jacob spoke of his gray hairs as brought with sorrow to the grave, and when the conspirators against Moses "went down alive into the pit," the same Hebrew word is employed in both cases, and means only the extinction of life. This last understanding of the word, as applicable to the passage under our survey, has found favor among distinguished writers in the Anglican Church; though it lies under the strong objection of being then but an inflated repetition of what immediately precedes, "was dead and buried." We cannot think that the same thing would be said directly over again in another

mode of expression; especially when we consider the brevity and condensed style of the whole formula. And yet Dr. Barrow takes this ground in his Exposition of the Creed; adding, however, that "if we interpret our Saviour's *descent into hell* for his soul's going into the common receptacle and mansion of souls, we shall be sure not substantially to mistake." Archbishop Leighton, in a sermon on the same subject, tells us, in his quaint way,— "The more noise hath been about this clause, I shall make the less. . . . I conceive, with submission, that it differs not much (possibly nothing) from the plain word of his *burial*." On the contrary, Sir Peter King, in his learned History of the Apostles' Creed, maintains the position, and we think with better success, that the realm of departed spirits is here alluded to, into which Christ descended. "As the disposal of his dead body," he reasons, "had been before declared in the term *buried*, so now there follows something in the Creed respecting solitarily and peculiarly his soul." With this opinion of the English chancellor, that of Bishop Pearson, who wrote at much length an Exposition of the same Creed, entirely agrees.

Thus far, then, we meet with no considerable perplexity. For we all admit, that the article means either no more than this, that the Saviour submitted to the common lot of mortality; or else no more than that, that his spirit went after death where other human spirits go. There is nothing in either of these assertions to trouble us. The difference between them is not so great as to be startling. But now there arise questions of a more bewildering sort. What purpose is implied in that descent? What objects were accomplished by it? What was Christ supposed to have done in that lower realm? Is there any foundation in the Scriptures for that article in the Creed? and if so, what is it? Here, if we were to enter at large into the matter,— which all common sense forefend!— we should find ourselves involved in abundant intricacies. Ambrose and Jerome express the idea, which they had derived from an earlier father, that before the death of the Redeemer all souls were obliged, on leaving the body, to go down into the under-world,— where, indeed, they were quite happy if they had been good; but that after he had descended into it, the righteous

were permitted to rise immediately into the full joy of heaven. Death and Hades, says Epiphanius, struggled to overpower and retain his spirit, not knowing the divinity that dwelt in it; but he rent asunder those adamantine bars, and by his own power loosed the bonds of Hades, bringing thence with him captive souls, as a pledge of future liberty to the rest. In the same strain wrote many others. Some of them even speak of a battle of three days waged with the angels of darkness, which were at length completely overthrown. According to this representation, Christ appears in the character of a hero and conqueror, prevailing against all the hosts of the "infernal seats," with him at their head who "had the power of death, that is, the Devil." - All this sounds, to be sure, more like poetry than theology. But better so than worse. Poetry let it be. It is the inspiration of comfort, and hope, and good courage; and that is infinitely preferable to the dogmas of dismay, gloomy and full of threats, that have usually been uppermost in theological dictation. One of the noble hymns of Watts glows with the conception that has just been expressed:—

"Laden with spoils from earth and hell,
The Conqueror comes with God to dwell."

It may be more like a rapture than like a lesson. But if we view it only as the figurative representation of moral truths, they must be cold indeed who cannot kindle with it. The imagination requires to be addressed as well as the other faculties of the mind. Historic facts are not the only realities there are. That may be true enough for a psalm which is not true enough for a catechism.

Another view was taken by some of the ancient writers as to what was transacted during the interval between the crucifixion and the resurrection of our Lord, presenting him to us under another and very different figure. It was a common opinion of the fathers, that the preaching of his Gospel to all who had died was the object of his descent, and the means by which the efficacy of his death was imparted to the souls below. The image here brought before us is that of a preacher, and not of a champion. Irenæus says, that therefore the Lord descended into the subterranean realms, preaching

even to them his advent for the remission of sins to those who believe in him. Clement of Alexandria insists on the same point. This preaching was of three days' duration, according to Cyril; who adds, that here was the fullest manifestation of his love for mankind, in saving not only such as were yet alive upon the earth, but in preaching forgiveness to those already departed, who sat in the recesses of the abyss. There is a line of the pretended sibyl, that sounds in the same tone:—

"Proclaiming hope to all, he will come into Hades;
Fulfil the doom of death till the sleep of the third day,
And then ascend into light, taking leave of the spirits departed."
Orac. Sib., Lib 8.

The two ideas now mentioned, if carried out and enlarged into their full dimensions, would exhaust the subject of the supposed scope of Christ's agency in "descending into hell";— unless we are disposed to join to these such moral ends as all can understand and feel, being rather matters of sentiment than of doctrine. Christ thus manifests the humility of his obedience and the encouragement of his example by leading the way for us wherever the poor human soul must travel. He sanctifies for us the unseen state of separation, and brightens its gloom, and appeases its terror. He exhibits to us, in a similitude at least, that the under-world— whatever that may be, and without attempting to define the shapeless— has been traversed by blessed feet, and has echoed to a heavenly voice, and lies subdued before the strength of the simplest believing heart.

We are ready now for the answer to the last question that was just proposed. On what Scriptural grounds does the article in the Creed rest? or does it profess to have any? We certainly cannot suppose that its framers, who are for the most part so Biblical in their expressions, considered it wholly destitute of such an essential support. There are, in fact, two passages in the Bible, which have been mainly appealed to, on this subject, from the beginning. The first is that celebrated verse of the 16th Psalm, which St. Peter quoted as prophetic to his hearers on the day of Pentecost:—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." According to the Apostle, "David spake of the resurrection of Christ,

that his soul was not left in hell." But if it was not left there, it must have previously been there. The inference is irresistible, and the Creed is so far justified. This is the text that has been the most frequently introduced and the most confidently relied on. We are willing to regard it as the principal authority for the insertion of the article we are speaking of in the place it holds. It carries with it the idea of triumph and exultation; in David's case, lifting him above every foe and every calamity, and in the case to which the Apostle Peter applies it, giving Christ the victory over the grave, "having loosed the pains (fettters) of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." Herein there is a correspondency with the former of the two figures, under which the ancient fathers conceived of the agency of Christ while his body was lying in Joseph's tomb,—that of a conqueror. We think that we need not enlarge any further on this department of our subject, and shall offer no useless apology for being short. We are convinced that conciseness is distinctness in treating matters of this kind.

But there is another text that has been much quoted in connection with this theme, and was mingled with it from the very beginning. It is of so curious an interest and of so doubtful an application, that we must be allowed to dwell upon it at some length. We find it in 1 Peter iii. 19, 20. "By which also," that is, by the Spirit, "he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." This was early applied to the explanation of the article, "He descended into hell"; and probably had no little share in establishing it where it stands. Here the other figure comes into action; and Christ is no longer like a warrior, subduing by force, but a preacher, prevailing by his word. The passage has been almost universally assumed to describe "the descent," both by ancient and modern writers. Who should "the spirits in prison" be, but those who had gone from this responsible life to dwell in the conscious empire of ghosts? And is it not plainly said, that "he went and preached" to them? So it appeared to them; and we need not enter into any further quotations from

the sainted names of the early ages of the Church in order to establish the fact so far as they are concerned. We will come down to our own age, and even here make but a single reference. Dr. Pott, who undertook the Catholic Epistles in the Koppian edition of the New Testament, "illustrated with a continuous annotation," entertains the same view. In a long "Excursus," set forth with numerous citations from the Greek and Latin classics, he speaks of the descent of Jesus to the shades; as if that was certainly the subject of St. Peter's language. He describes it, indeed, only as one of the myths of sacred story. His only very marked peculiarity is, that, with the slight argument and bold assertion that are not uncommon to his class, he assigns as the reason why the Saviour appeared as a preacher to the inhabitants of the lower regions, the propriety of keeping up the character which he had sustained and the office that had employed him while he was on earth. This was according to the analogy of ancient opinion, he says. Thus Minos, according to Homer, continues to judge below, as he had done in the upper air. "In like manner, the shades of Agamemnon, Achilles, Hercules, and other heroes, talk with Ulysses and Æneas about their exploits on earth. So Tiresias, according to Horace, goes on to exercise his prophetic gift in the other world, and Orion follows the chase still." We might repeat much more of the same kind, and of still less dignity, but will spare ourselves and our readers. We ought, however, in justice to the learned professor, to quote another of his examples, which is more becoming, if not more apposite, than the rest. The prophet Isaiah, in predicting the downfall of the king of Babylon, describes all the kings of the nations as rising from their infernal thrones to meet him at his coming. They sat as kings, even there.

But there are grave difficulties in the way of supposing that St. Peter here makes any allusion to an imagined visitation of the lower world by Christ after his passion. They are difficulties that in our judgment are insuperable. A reviewer of Dr. Pott's work in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek* (Vol. III. p. 529) glances slightly at two of these objections. In the first place, it is evident to every attentive reader of the Apostle's words in the pas-

sage adduced, that "the Spirit" spoken of is not the soul of Christ at all, but the Spirit of God which instructed, animated, and empowered him; and which, though poured upon him in a special manner and without measure, had been always manifesting itself to the world. And then, why should the people who had lived in Noah's time be singled out as the only subjects to whom the preaching was addressed? Or granting that they are only brought forward as representing the whole of an unbelieving world, which is rather a forced construction, why should the great privilege of the revealing and saving word be confined to the "disobedient," and not extended to the worthier part of the buried world that had long before gone down into silence? The reviewer in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek* adopts a mode of interpretation which deserves on several accounts to be briefly set forth. It is not an uncommon one; it has some appearances strongly in its favor; it is learned without being too far-fetched; and it may be looked upon as the first departure from the more literal and vulgar understanding of the passage in Peter's Epistle. According to this explanation, "the spirits in prison" are really those who had been "disobedient in the days of Noah." The Spirit in Christ really did preach to them; only this preaching was done while they were yet in the flesh, and not after the flood had covered them for thousands of years, and consigned them to their dark "prison." It gave warning and instruction even so far back as the antediluvian days, when "the ark was a preparing," and Noah—who was not without the same "Spirit"—was "a preacher of righteousness." This notion may seem strange at first, but soon becomes clear. It is perfectly Scriptural. It puts no forced meaning upon language. It gives a natural sense, and a reasonable sense. It need not appear repulsive to us, that Christ should be described as having spoken to those former generations. The New Testament, in several instances, asserts of its Messiah what is related in the Old Testament of the Spirit of the Lord, and of his anointed servants of old. Thus Paul exhorts the Corinthians not to "tempt Christ as some of them in the wilderness tempted him." Peter in this very Epistle (i. 11) speaks of "the Spirit of Christ" as having been in the prophets. He is supposed

to allude, in the passage under review, to Genesis vi. 3:—"And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man," that is, for his reformation; "his days shall yet be a hundred and twenty years." The import of which is conjectured to be, that the means of amendment vouchsafed to those ancient offenders through the instructions of the early patriarchs should not be continued further; but that after a hundred and twenty years, if they failed to repent, the watery ruin should sweep them away. Such was "the long-suffering of God, that waited in the days of Noah."

We might be inclined at first to rest in this explanation as quite satisfactory. But there is another mode of construing the Apostle's words, that attracts us more strongly. It sets them in a wholly different light, and has the advantage of greater simplicity and a more practical bearing, while it is equally justified by a sober criticism. To make this the better understood, we shall begin with offering a different translation of the passage: "having been put to death in the flesh, but restored to life by the Spirit; by which, after his departure, he preached to imprisoned souls, which" (i. e. the like of which, or such as) "had aforesaid disbelieved when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." The departure spoken of is his ascension into heaven; and not his descent among the dead, nor his imaginary mission to those who for centuries had now been joined to that unseen company. The Spirit was that which he communicated to his disciples after he had left them, and by which they were inaugurated to preach the Gospel of redemption to all them that were bound. The hearers of this preached testimony were not the very persons of Noah's day;—how could that be?—but persons in a like situation with them; in thralldom to wickedness and misery, and shut up unto death. Such were the heathen nations when Christ appeared. This view of the subject, instead of looking back to the cloudy ages of the past, looks forward to the coming time. Not only is there no trace of the under-world before its contemplation, but no question about ancient destinies. Instead of "spirits in prison," who had passed to their account before the world had any exact history, or any history at all, it turns its thought towards the ages of

living men, captives of sin and fear, who were to inherit the earth under the dispensation of the Christian faith. Gilbert Wakefield's version corresponds to the one we have given in a principal respect: "he went and preached to the minds of *men* in prison; who were *also* hard to be convinced in former times; *as* when the patience," &c. If we should be asked why any mention should be made of these antediluvian culprits, we might reply, that it was a favorite habit of the Apostolic writers to make allusion to the great points of Hebrew tradition; and that the context, with its word about baptism, shows the peculiar propriety of following it in the present instance. We might add to these considerations, that perhaps the Apostle introduced this reference to indicate the superior effects of the preaching of the Saviour above those that the patriarchs produced by their admonitions. These last were of no avail. The spirit that then spoke and wrought did not redeem. Noah gave warning, but it was not credited. The ark that was preparing was the greatest warning of all. As an old writer expresses it, it "spoke God's mind; and every knock of the hammers preached unto them." But they disregarded it. The floods were making ready to join their voice also, and would soon make the globe rounder than it was before, under their smooth surface of destruction; but no signs of repentance were seen. How different was the result here! The promise of mercy availed more than the threat of ruin had done. How striking was the contrast to the provoked judgment of that early day, under the descent of the Holy Spirit, with the "sound as of a rushing, mighty wind," but with none of the devastations of a storm, and with its shapes of harmless fire! Then was the world converted, and not drowned. Then did the gentle drops of a saving baptism take the place of that sea of death. Then did the ark of safety, that held but eight human beings, appear a small thing compared with the Church that opened its courts of a boundless salvation, to contain "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands."

The first writer, so far as we know, who entertained any thing like such an opinion of St. Peter's meaning, was no less a person than Augustin himself. He was full in the faith of the descent into hell, which he de-

clared that none but an infidel could deny ; but he could not find any hint of it here. He denied that the doctrine rested on any thing here said. He plainly asserted that the passage had nothing at all to do with the infernal regions. He felt his mind pressed by the same difficulties that we have mentioned. These he states at some length in a remarkable letter written to his friend Evodius, in answer to some questions proposed by him on the subject. It is the ninety-ninth letter of his correspondence. On the supposition that the advent of Christ into Hades is here described, Why, he asks, should he have singled out those incorrigible transgressors, and them only, as the subjects of his teaching, passing by such an innumerable multitude of others ? Why did he not speak to the orators and poets of antiquity, whom we so much admire ? Or if he did, why did the Apostle wholly omit them ? Besides, people die still, never having heard of the Gospel ; — who shall go and preach it to *them* ? The "spirits in prison," he says, may well enough mean human minds closed in by the shades of ignorance, as if between prison-walls. Not in the infernal regions, but here, they are liberated. He even asserts, that " this transaction relates to persons who should arise hereafter ; as they who do not believe the Gospel now are like those who did not believe then, while the ark was preparing." Augustin was evidently perplexed about the matter, and had not wholly made up his judgment concerning it. In one part of the letter he intimates, that " before Christ came in the flesh, he had often come in the Spirit" ; and this leads us to suppose that he was inclined to favor the interpretation which we have cited as that of the reviewer in Eichhorn. We do not wonder at his perplexity. We wonder rather at the acute spirit of his remarks.

The view to which we have given our preference was unfolded, for the first time within our knowledge, by an illustrious man, who lived between two and three hundred years ago, and was a chief light of his times. Engaged in poetry, history, theology, and public affairs, he was the most distinguished scholar and civilian and statesman that Holland has ever produced ; and one who should be dear to the lovers of letters, religion, and liberty, everywhere. While he defended the freedom of the

seas against the pretensions of England, and the rights of the mind against island and continent, and laid down the principles of law for war and peace, he wrote liberal commentaries on all the Scriptures, and one of the best books that had been written on the evidences of Christianity. His country, under the influence of political prejudices and religious bigotry, sentenced him to perpetual imprisonment, from which he escaped only by the loving ingenuity of his wife; and it afterwards banished him for ever from its shores. But the name of its great citizen will be remembered after its dikes give way, and the sea that once broke in upon Dort shall cover the whole land. Thus much we have felt compelled to say of Hugo Grotius. His opinion on the subject before us was adopted in its whole extent by Archbishop Leighton in a note to his "Commentary upon the First Epistle of Peter"; though he had at first written in favor of the preceding theory of St. Augustin, which was certainly a very plausible one. "They that dream of the descent of Christ's soul into hell," says the good prelate, a little scornfully, "think this place somewhat that way; but it cannot, by the strongest wresting, be drawn to fit their purpose." We have only one remark further to make on this point. In King Edward the Sixth's time, the first clause of the fifth article of the Creed was expounded authoritatively by the passage in Peter. But at a synod held ten years afterwards, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the descent into hell was barely mentioned, without any explication as to the manner or grounds of it.

We arrive at the conclusion, as the sum of what has been said, that the confession of the Apostles' Creed, "He descended into hell," can mean nothing more than either that Christ lay in the grave, or that his departed soul went to the place of other souls departed. It came late into the Creed, and has not the least authority. So far as it is supposed to rest upon the passage in the Psalm of David, it leans upon a mere shadow of Scripture sanction. So far as it appeals to the passage in Peter, it sets up a false claim. Our task is thus ended. But we cannot leave so singular a portion of the New Testament as the last named, so much contended about, so fertile of reflections, and one that has occupied us so

long, without asking pardon of our readers for taking up the office of preacher ourselves for a moment, and moralizing our dissertation. The idea of "spirits in prison" has been brought before us. And these, as we have been led to understand, are no shades of departed men, but souls like our own, in bodies like our own. We are, all of us, spirits inclosed in flesh. We are girt in by narrow limits both of the senses and the understanding. We touch but what is near to us. We hear but for a few furlongs. We see but for a few miles. Our reasonings, as well as our perceptions, move in a straitened round. We are imprisoned within the decrees of nature and fortune, even when we are most faithful to God. And if we are unfaithful, if we are brought into captivity by vicious inclinations, and convicted by our own consciences, into what dungeons of gloomy and desperate thought shall we be cast! With what fetters of iron weight and burning torment shall we be bound! We are all in some degree enslaved where we are entitled to our freedom. Every passion that gains the mastery, every bad habit that rivets its chain, every servile dread and every guilty remembrance that make us hide ourselves and quake, are portions of the soul's bondage. It is not the design of the Gospel to enlarge the boundaries of our physical state. That must be done by natural science and material means, so far as it is to be done at all. It did not come to set us free from mortal trials and sorrows, except by teaching us to survey them with a juster discernment, and to endure them with a more composed heart. But it bends its whole power towards our emancipation from every unrighteousness, and upon the inability to be comforted and to confide. We shall all be beset with tighter restrictions than cramp us now. Age will throw its fetters round our motions, or maladies will hide our eyes from the light; and death will lay us out at our length,* and we must see the land of its terrible shadow. But there is a divine reality in the might of him who can give us enlargement even out of these confines. We are all "prisoners of hope." Give us the hope that saves men.

N. L. F.

* Μοῖρα τανηλεγίος θανάτου.

ART. IV.—INDIAN ANTIQUITIES IN NORTH AMERICA.*

SEVERAL years have passed since the appearance of Mr. Squier's volume on the Aboriginal Monuments of the Mississippi Valley. This valuable work, embodying the results of extensive explorations made chiefly by the author and his coadjutor, Mr. Davis, went far to dispel the Egyptian darkness which shrouded the earlier eras of America. It is marked throughout by a philosophic spirit; by a freedom from theory and speculations; by acuteness, good sense, and diligent research. The copious materials are skilfully arranged, and the reader is left for the most part to form his own conclusions from the facts laid before him.

These conclusions are often of a highly interesting kind. That, long before the discovery of America, large portions of the Mississippi Valley were tenanted by a people farther advanced towards civilization than the existing Indian tribes, is a fact which is made manifest by very slight examination of the traces they have left behind. It remained for Mr. Squier to explain the character and condition of this ancient people, a task which in no small degree he has accomplished. That they must have lived under an effective organization of some kind is clear, he argues, from the remains of so many extensive and complicated works of religion and defence, which, without such organization, would neither have been planned nor executed. That they lived under the influence of some overshadowing superstition is apparent from the colossal remnants of their temples and sacred inclosures. Finally, they must have been an agricultural people; for the dense population which the construction of such works presupposes could never have been sustained by the scanty products of barter or the chase.

An interesting question here arises. What relation

* 1. *Aboriginal Monuments of the State of New York, comprising the Results of Original Surveys and Explorations; with an Illustrative Appendix.* By E. G. SQUIER, A. M. Accepted for Publication by the Smithsonian Institution, October 20th, 1849. 4to. pp. 188.

2. *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois.* By LEWIS H. MORGAN. Rochester: Sage & Brother. New York: Mark H. Newman & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1851. 8vo. pp. 477.

did this lost people bear to the nations of Mexico, and the hunter tribes who still subsist beyond the Mississippi? It is needless, perhaps, to premise, that throughout the continent all the existing tribes and nations of aborigines are stamped with the unquestionable impress of a common race; and to this great American race we need not hesitate to refer the builders of the Western mounds. Nor need we hesitate to assign them a place in the social scale midway between the semi-civilization of Mexico and the barbarism of the hunter tribes. In the mounds are found numerous sculptures wrought in stone, with a degree of skill to which the modern tribes of the same region could make no pretensions. These sculptures usually represent birds, beasts, or reptiles, carved with a wonderful fidelity and with great minuteness. Among them, however, are many representations of the human face. The latter — we judge from an examination of the sculptures themselves — uniformly exhibit those marked peculiar features which belong to the American race, from the Isthmus to the land of the Esquimaux. Again, the hill-forts and vast circumvallations in the valley of the Ohio bear a curious analogy to the defensive works of the Tlascalans and other Mexican nations at the period of Cortéz's invasion. The sacred mounds, also, which frequently occur in the Western and Southern States, and which are described by Mr. Squier under the name of *temple-mounds*, bear a singular resemblance to the *teocallis* of Mexico.

These circumstances cannot fail to suggest interesting inquiries. Were the mound-builders a distinct and independent people? Were they, on the other hand, a colonial offshoot of the nations of Mexico? Or are we justified in the conjecture, that in truth the Mississippi Valley was the nursery of Mexican semi-civilization? There is no reason to despair that future researches will resolve our doubts on these points, and throw clear light on this dark mystery.

In the condition of this ancient people, as shown by the traces they have left behind, there is nothing which need excite any special admiration or wonderment, nothing to kindle the fancy with dreams of vanished splendor. If not savages, they were at least barbarians; they killed their enemies with flint-headed arrows, or bruised

them to death with mallets of stone. They adorned their persons with bracelets of native copper and beads of stone and shell; and they buried their dead in coffins of unhewn logs. Yet the sculptures with which they decorated the bowls of their tobacco-pipes indicate, as we have already mentioned, no slight degree of artistic skill; while the fact, that their sacred inclosures, though sometimes embracing an area of many acres, are often formed with mathematical precision into the figures of circles and squares, displays a degree of knowledge altogether beyond the pretensions of the modern hunter tribes.

Probably, at the time of the discovery of America, no aboriginal nation was extant whose political and social state corresponded precisely with that of the ancient mound-builders. Of all the modern tribes which have tenanted the Mississippi Valley, none have fulfilled more nearly the required conditions than the singular people called the Natchez. They dwelt near the site of the American town to which they have left their name, and their manners have been amply described by Du Pratz, Charlevoix, Le Petit, and other observers. They were an agricultural people. They built rude temples to the Sun, where, under the charge of priests, the sacred fire burned unceasingly. Like the Peruvians, with whom, however, they bear no comparison in respect of social progress, they lived under the spiritual and temporal sway of a race of chiefs claiming to be Children of the Sun. To the head chief was given, *par excellence*, the title of the Great Sun. His subjects regarded him with awe and veneration. They dared not disobey his mandates, and at his death numbers were immolated on his funeral pile. If we suppose a tribe like the Natchez, though somewhat more advanced in the arts, expanded into a numerous population and planted in the valley of the Ohio, nothing seems more probable than that, under the priestly despotism of the Children of the Sun, they would have thrown up rude earth temples and inclosures not unlike those whose vestiges have so long perplexed the antiquary. We write this simply by way of illustration, and to show that we need not have recourse to any extravagant hypothesis to explain the origin of these mysterious monuments.

In the summer of 1848, having completed his survey of the Western mounds, Mr. Squier, under the combined auspices of the New York Historical Society and the Smithsonian Institution, commenced an examination of the aboriginal monuments of New York.¹ After an absence of two months, he returned laden with antiquarian relics, clay pipes and stone axes, rusty gun-barrels and tomahawks, beads, wampum, and arrow-heads. During his short absence he had ascertained the localities of about a hundred aboriginal earth-works, and visited and surveyed half this number. The results of these examinations are embodied in the work whose title stands first at the head of this article.

It has hitherto been supposed that the aboriginal remains of New York were coeval with those of the Mississippi Valley. The same mystery has involved them; the same crude and wild speculations have been thrown out concerning them. Mr. Squier had shared the general impression of their antiquity, but personal examination has induced him to change his opinion. None of these remains exhibit that mathematical accuracy of form which often distinguishes the earth-works of the Mississippi Valley. Again, and this fact is still more significant, the weapons, tools, and other relics found in their neighborhood, are precisely the same with those which occur so abundantly near the sites of modern Indian towns. Within the inclosures are often to be found subterranean repositories, containing stores of parched corn not yet consumed by time. But we will let Mr. Squier speak for himself: —

“In respect to date, nothing positive can be affirmed. Many of them are now covered with heavy forests; a circumstance upon which too much importance has been laid, and which in itself may not necessarily be regarded as indicative of great age, for we may plausibly suppose that it was not essential to the purposes of the builders that the forest should be removed. Still I have seen trees from one to three feet in diameter standing upon the embankments and in the trenches; which would certainly carry back the date of their construction several hundred years, perhaps beyond the period of the discovery in the fifteenth century. There is nothing, however, in this circumstance, nor in any other bearing upon the subject, which would necessarily imply that they were built by tribes anterior to those found in occupation of the country by the whites. And this brings us at

once to the most interesting point of our inquiry, namely, *By whom were these works erected?*

"I have already mentioned, that within them are found many relics of art and many traces of occupancy. These, I had ample opportunities of ascertaining in the course of my investigations, are absolutely *identical* with those which mark the sites of towns and forts known to have been occupied by the Indians within the historical period. The pottery taken from these sites and from within the supposed ancient inclosures is alike in all respects; the pipes and ornaments are undistinguishable; and the indications of aboriginal dwellings are precisely similar, and, so far as can be discovered, have equal claim to antiquity. Near many of these works are found cemeteries, in which well-preserved skeletons are contained, and which, except in the absence of remains of European art, differ in no essential respect from the cemeteries found in connection with the abandoned modern towns and 'castles' of the Indians. There are other not less important facts and coincidences, all of which go to establish that, if the earth-works of Western New York are of a remote ancient date, they were not only *secondarily*, but *generally*, occupied by the Iroquois or neighboring and contemporary nations; or else — and this hypothesis is most consistent and reasonable — they were erected by them." — p. 81.

From this hypothesis we see no reason to dissent. All early writers who have spoken at length of the Iroquois have not failed to remark that the fortified works constructed by them far surpassed in strength and extent those of other tribes. Their villages were surrounded by strong palisades, in single, double, or triple rows, and these palisades, we are told, were kept upright by means of earth heaped against their bases. If this were the case, the ruins of the structure, after the palisades were burnt, or decayed, would exhibit an appearance of a low, continuous ridge or embankment similar to those so often to be seen within the limits of New York.

Thus we emerge from the clouds and darkness of a midnight era, where even the dubious light of tradition cannot penetrate, into the broad, clear field of historic inquiry. And here a new sun has risen, revealing the scene before us in all its breadth and depth. Mr. Morgan's work on the aboriginal tribes of New York is a production of singular merit.

Many will remember, that early in the year 1847 a series of papers appeared in the American Review, upon

the institutions and customs of the Iroquois. They attracted well-deserved attention, from the scholarlike conciseness of their style, the novelty of their materials, and the intimate knowledge which they displayed of the subject under discussion. They were copied into *The Olden Time*, an antiquarian journal published at Pittsburg, and copious extracts appeared in historical compilations and other books of the kind. These papers were from the pen of Mr. Morgan, and are embodied in the present work, of which they form an essential part. A large amount of collateral matter, of equal or superior interest, has been added, and the whole forms a complete account of the political and domestic life of the Iroquois.

Living among the remnants of this remarkable people, and being himself an adopted member of one of their principal tribes, Mr. Morgan has enjoyed unrivalled opportunities for pursuing his researches. He has met with signal success. No one can fully appreciate the work before us who does not know from what confused, incoherent materials it was constructed. We cannot too highly praise the powers of keen analysis with which the author pursued his investigations, the discrimination with which he separated the ore from the dross, and the skill with which he unfolds his intricate subject before the mind of the reader. The institutions of the Iroquois have never before been so exhibited. A few attempts have been made; but without opportunities like those of Mr. Morgan, joined with zeal and ability like his, the task could never be thoroughly accomplished. It is a matter of congratulation, that, before it is too late, one has been found to build this monument to the memory of a fading race.

To find fault with a book of so much merit is not a pleasing task; but in truth Mr. Morgan has been led into some degree of error by the very zeal and devotion with which he has labored. He ascribes to the Iroquois legislators a wisdom and forecast, and a refining spirit, beyond what is, as we conceive, justly their due. In his pages their peculiar institutions assume an appearance of too much studied adjustment and careful elaboration. Mr. Morgan does not appear to have examined with particular attention the social phenomena of any other Indian nations than those which form his immediate theme.

This circumstance is not without advantages. It saves him from certain temptations to speculation and theory ; but, at the same time, it leads him to regard as the peculiar distinction of the Iroquois, that which in fact is common to many other tribes, while it excludes much light which would otherwise have been thrown indirectly on his subject. We shall soon have occasion to illustrate our meaning.

The first chapter of the work treats of the early history of the Iroquois, and is introductory in its nature. In the third chapter Mr. Morgan enters in earnest upon his subject, and dissects and lays open to view the political organization of the confederacy. His information is derived from personal study and observation of the workings of these singular institutions, which, through all the changes of the last eventful century, have still continued to exist. The following extract from the preface alludes to the favorable circumstances under which the investigation was pursued :—

“ As this work does not profess to be based upon authorities, a question may arise in the mind of the reader, whence its materials were derived, or what reliance is to be placed upon its statements. The credibility of a witness is known to depend chiefly upon his means of knowledge. For this reason, it may not be inappropriate to state, that circumstances in early life, not necessary to be related, brought the author into frequent intercourse with the descendants of the Iroquois, and led to his adoption as a Seneca. This gave him favorable opportunities for studying minutely into their social organization, and the structure and principles of the ancient League. Copious notes were made from time to time, when leisure enabled him to prosecute his researches among them, until these had accumulated beyond the bounds of the present volume. As the materials increased in quantity and variety, the interest awakened in the subject finally induced the idea of its arrangement for publication.”

It would be useless, within the limits of a brief article, to attempt describing the Iroquois institutions with any fulness of detail. For such description we must refer to the book itself, where, even in the condensed style of Mr. Morgan, many pages are occupied with the necessary explanations. We shall only indicate the prominent and essential features.

The Iroquois consisted of five distinct, independent

nations, the Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, and Senecas. These five members were banded in a strong confederacy. The sachems, or principal civil chiefs of all the nations, united to form the grand council of the league. This council administered all foreign affairs, and in some measure regulated the domestic concerns of the Iroquois.

But the great distinctive feature of the league still remains to be mentioned. The whole Iroquois people, irrespective of their division into nations, consisted of eight tribes, each distinguished by the name of some animal whose figure formed its badge or device. All the members of each tribe were bound together by the strongest ties of fraternity. The members of the Wolf tribe, for example, whether Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, or Senecas, looked on each other with a strong regard. Thus, it will be seen, the five nations were laced together by an eightfold band of tribal relationship.

The rule of succession to the sachemship, or a seat in the grand council, is too remarkable to pass unnoticed. This succession was in a broad and qualified sense hereditary. But among the Iroquois, all property and all dignities descended in the female line. Thence it happened that the son of the sachem was perpetually disinherited. A brother, a sister's son, or any other relative on the female side, might gain the vacant office, but the son of the deceased ruler could never hope to fill his father's place. Thus one of the strongest temptations of ambition was completely cut off.

Mr. Morgan has unravelled the whole fabric of Iroquois polity with the hand of a master and the spirit of an earnest searcher after truth. But for him, its texture, in all probability, would never have been fully made known. It only remains for us to examine how far these institutions were peculiar to the Iroquois; to inquire whether they proceeded from deliberate legislation, or whether they were not, in great measure, the results of spontaneous development and fortuitous circumstance.

The fundamental principle of the league, and its greatest safeguard, lay in the system of tribal divisions. This system is by no means confined to the Iroquois. It is to be found with various modifications among numer-

ous tribes speaking languages radically distinct, Iroquois, Algonquin, and Mobilian. Its nature is peculiar and needs explanation. Suppose several clans of Scotch Highlanders, McDonald, Campbell, and McGregor, the members of each being knit together by certain ties of kindred, real or imagined. Suppose that the members of the same clan were forbidden to intermarry,—that McDonald could not marry McDonald, but must seek a wife among the McGregors or the Campbells. Thus it would soon happen that the three clans would become closely intermixed, though each might retain to a considerable degree its ancient pride of birth and name. These mingled clans would then become a tolerably exact counterpart of an Indian community. One great distinction must, however, be observed. Among Indians the descent of the tribeship is usually in the female line. Thus, where a man of the Wolf tribe takes a wife from that of the Hawks, the children will be Hawks and not Wolves.

This system prevailed very generally among the Indians east of the Mississippi. Adair and Hawkins affirm that it existed among the Cherokees and Creeks. Gallatin discovered it among the Choctaws. It appears from the garbled accounts of Loskiel, that it was to be found in a modified form among the Delawares; and many writers have mentioned it as occurring among the Algonquins of the North. Among the Wyandots, a nation kindred to the Iroquois, it flourished in perfection, as may be found by any one who will closely observe the remnants of that tribe, living, when we last saw them, on the frontiers of Missouri.

The number of the tribes varies, in different communities, from three up to thirty or forty. A Choctaw chief told Mr. Gallatin at Washington, that his nation consisted of eight tribes divided into two classes of four each. It is not a little remarkable, that the same number of tribes and the same classifications prevailed among the Iroquois. Among the Ojibwas, again, the tribes seem indefinitely multiplied, and, according to the observations of Mr. Schoolcraft, the child follows the tribe of its father, and not of its mother. Yet, even in this nation, where the tribal system exists in its loosest and most imperfect state, the members of each tribe often ad-

here to each other with singular tenacity through good and evil fortune.

The descent of chiefs in the female line is a custom closely connected with the system of tribeship. Like the latter, it may be traced over a wide extent of territory. Of the various writers who have described the manners of the Natchez, few have omitted to mention this rule of inheritance. Hawkins observed it among the Creeks. Carver found it among some of the nations of the Upper Mississippi. Loskiel ascribes it to the Delawares, and Brebeuf to the Wyandots. Indeed, evidence on this point might be accumulated to a large amount. The probable origin of the custom is obvious, and does no credit to Indian society. In communities where the bond of marriage was by no means strictly regarded, such a provision would afford the only security that the heir should in truth be a blood relative of the deceased.

Thus, it will be seen, the two fundamental principles which form the groundwork of Iroquois polity are not confined to that people alone. They existed among many Indian nations, but with this difference, that while in the one instance they were moulded into a regular and systematic form, they remained in the other crude, raw, and undigested.

The confederation of several nations is not an anomaly in Indian history. Many imperfect attempts of the kind are on record. Nations have often been known to act in concert, and hold a council-fire in common, but for strength, efficiency, and permanency, the league of the Iroquois is without a parallel. This people were distinguished in a high degree by energy, stability, and, we may add, ferocity of temper. Their moral and intellectual superiority over most of the surrounding tribes cannot be denied. Their sachems had the wisdom to discern the advantages of a confederacy, and the skill to establish it on a lasting basis; but it is needless to suppose that out of a profound sense of their political advantages they instituted the customs which entered essentially into their scheme of government, since there is every reason to believe that these customs were ready formed to their hands.

The league, as it seems to us, must have been formed in a manner somewhat as follows. That the Iroquois

were once a single, undivided people, is evident from the distribution of the tribes; for each of the eight tribes has its representatives in each of the five nations. The exigencies of savage life might easily have produced the separation. Circumstances of this kind are common in Indian history. In such cases each portion of the dismembered community assumes a name of its own. The divided Iroquois, harassed by the attacks of enemies, or threatened with a general inroad, might have been led to see the advantages of a league; and to effect this end, the most simple and obvious course would have been, that the sachems of all the nations should unite in a common council. When this was done, when a few functionaries had been appointed, and certain necessary forms and regulations established, the league would have found itself, without any very elaborate legislation, in the condition in which it stood at the period of its highest prosperity. Under similar circumstances, the Wyandots might have formed a similar scheme of polity, since the requisite materials existed among them, as well as among the Iroquois. Indeed, the Wyandots, in character, habits, and customs, bear a marked resemblance to the more renowned nations of the league.

We would gladly follow Mr. Morgan through the interesting part of the volume which describes the mythology, the legendary lore, the customs, habits, and character, of the Iroquois; but the reader must have recourse to his pages. The following passage, introduced in connection with the religious belief of the Five Nations, conveys a singular tribute to the memory of Washington.

“ Among the modern beliefs engrafted upon the ancient faith, there is one which is worthy of particular notice. It relates to Washington. According to their present belief, no white man ever reached the Indian heaven. Not having been created by the Great Spirit, no provision was made for him in their scheme of theology. He was excluded both from heaven and the place of punishment. But an exception was made in favor of Washington. Because of his justice and benevolence to the Indian, he stood preëminent above all other white men. When, by the peace of 1763, the Indians were abandoned by their English allies, and left to make their own terms with the American government, the Iroquois were more exposed to severe measures than the other tribes in their alliance. At this critical moment, Washing-

ton interfered in their behalf, as the protector of Indian rights, and the advocate of a policy towards them of the most enlightened justice and humanity. After his death, he was mourned by the Iroquois as a benefactor of their race, and his memory was cherished with reverence and affection. A belief was spread abroad among them, that the Great Spirit had received him into a celestial residence upon the plains of heaven, the only white man whose noble deeds had entitled him to this heavenly favor. Just by the entrance of heaven is a walled inclosure, the ample grounds within which are laid out with avenues and shaded walks. Within is a spacious mansion, constructed in the fashion of a fort. Every object in nature which could please a cultivated taste has been gathered in this blooming Eden, to render it a delightful dwelling-place for the immortal Washington. The faithful Indian, as he enters heaven, passes this inclosure. He sees and recognizes the illustrious inmate, as he walks to and fro in quiet meditation. But no word ever passes his lips. Dressed in his uniform, and in a state of perfect felicity, he is destined to remain through eternity in the solitary enjoyment of the celestial residence prepared for him by the Great Spirit." — p. 178.

The volume is illustrated by excellent engravings, and by a map of the Iroquois country at a period when the league was in full vigor, exhibiting the position of their villages, their ancient trails, the boundaries of the several nations, and the names by which they designated spots where American towns have since arisen. It is much to be wished that the wretched titles borrowed from antiquity, with which vulgarity and ignorance have plentifully besprinkled our maps, might give place to the sonorous names of the Iroquois. Such a consummation, however, is rather to be desired than hoped for. We will not, however, despair but that the time may come when good taste will have sufficient sway in our republic to cause the restoration of the ancient titles of fields, streams, and mountains. Meanwhile, we cordially commend the work of Mr. Morgan to the study of all with whom the character and customs of those who preceded us on this soil are objects of interest.

F. P. jr.

ART. V.—THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF DEATH
AND LIFE.

WE propose to gather up, and present in one view, the essential Christian doctrine of death and life. At the same time we shall aim to show the actual falsity of the dogmas often ascribed to it, and the actual truth of the views it does really present. The distinctive opinions of the several writers of the New Testament relate to particulars not of fundamental or vital importance. In regard to the broad, essential principles of the subject, they all agree. It is of this common ground that we propose now to treat, endeavoring to project it clearly into recognition, and to explain and justify it by facts of reason, experience, and observation.

Let us first notice the emphatic sense, the uncommon amount of meaning, which Christ and the Apostolic writers usually put into the words *Death*, *Life*, and other kindred terms. These words are scarcely ever used merely in their literal sense, but are charged with a vivid and fresh fulness of significance, not to be fathomed without especial attention. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Obviously, this means more than simple life, because those who overlook the laws of virtue may still live. It signifies, distinctively, true life, the experience of inward peace and of Divine favor. "Who-soever hateth his brother hath not eternal life abiding in him, but abideth in death"; that is to say, a soul rankling with bad passions is "in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity," but when converted from hatred to love, it passes from wretchedness to blessedness. "Let the dead bury their dead." No one reading this passage with its context can fail to perceive that it means, substantially,— "Let those who are absorbed in the affairs of this world, and indifferent to the revelation I have brought from heaven, attend to the interment of the dead; but delay not thou, who art kindled with a lively interest in the truth, to proclaim the kingdom of God." When the returning prodigal had been joyfully received, the father said, in reply to the murmurs of the elder son, "Thy brother was dead and is alive again"; he was lost in sin and misery, he is found in penitence and happi-

ness. Paul writes thus to the Romans: — “Without the law sin was dead, and I was alive; but when the law was made known, sin came to life, and I died.” In other words, when a man is ignorant of the moral law, immoral conduct does not prevent him from feeling innocent and being at peace; but when a knowledge of the law shows the wickedness of that conduct, he becomes conscious of guilt, and is unhappy. For instance, to state the thought a little differently, to a child knowing nothing of the law, the law, or its purposed violation, sin, does not exist, is dead; he therefore enjoys peace of conscience; but when he becomes aware of the law and its authority, if he then breaks it, sin is generated and immediately stings, and spiritual happiness dies.

These passages, though many similar to them might be adduced, are sufficient to show that Christianity uses the words *death* and *life* in a figurative, spiritual sense, penetrating to the hidden realities of the soul. To speak thus of the guilty, unbelieving man as dead, and only of the virtuous, believing man as truly alive, may seem at first a bold, and even startling, use of figurative language. It will not appear so when we notice its appropriateness to the case, or remember the imaginative nature of Oriental speech, and recollect how often we employ the same terms in the same way at the present time. The fitness of the language, and how naturally it would be suggested, is so evident as to need no illustration. It will be in place, however, to give a few examples of its use outside of the Scriptures. The Pythagoreans, when one of their number became impious and abandoned, were accustomed to consider him as dead, and to erect a tomb to him, on which his name and his age at the time of his moral decease were engraved. The Roman law regarded an excommunicated citizen as *civilis mortuus*, legally dead. Fénelon writes, — “God has kindled a flame in the bottom of every heart, which should always burn as a lamp for him who hath lighted it, and all other life is as death.” Chaucer says, in one of his Canterbury Tales, referring to a man enslaved by dissolute habits, —

“But certes, he that haunteth swiche delices,
Is ded while that he liveth in tho' vices.”

And in a recent poem the following lines occur: —

"From his eyes
The light has fled;
When faith departs, when honor dies,
The man is dead."

To be subjected to the lower impulses of our nature by degraded habits of vice and criminality is wretchedness and death. The true life of man consists, the Great Teacher declared, "not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth, but rather in his being rich toward God," in conscious purity of heart, energy of faith, and union with the Holy Spirit. "He that lives in sensual pleasure is dead while he lives," Paul asserts, but he that lives in spiritual righteousness has already risen from the dead, after the likeness of the resurrection of Christ. To sum up the whole in a single sentence, the service and the fruits of sin form an experience which Christianity justly calls death, because it is a state of insensibility to all the aims, elements, and results of true life, in the adequate sense of that term, meaning the serene activity and religious joy of the soul.

The second particular in the essential doctrine of Christianity concerning the states of human experience which it entitles death and life, is their inherent, enduring nature, their independence on the objects and changes of this world. The Gospel teaches that the elements of our being and experience are transferred from the life that now is into the life that is to come, or rather, that we exist continuously for ever, uninterrupted by the event of physical dissolution. "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him," Jesus declares, "shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." John affirms,—"The world passeth away, and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." Paul writes to the Christians at Rome,— "In that Christ died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God." Numerous additional texts of kindred import, in the New Testament, might be cited, were it necessary. They announce the immortality of man, the unending continuance of the Christian consciousness, unless forfeited by voluntary defection. They show that sin and woe are not arbitrarily bounded by the limits of time and sense in the grave, and that nothing can ever exhaust or destroy

the satisfaction of true life, a real faith in the love of God; it abides, blessed and eternal, in the uninterrupted blessedness and eternity of its Object. The revelation and offer of all this to the acceptance of men, its conditions, claims, and alternative sanctions, were first divinely made known and planted in the heart of the world, as the Scriptures everywhere with emphasis and repetition assert, by Jesus Christ, who promulgated them by his preaching, illustrated them by his example, proved them by his works, attested them by his blood, and crowned them by his resurrection. And now there is opened for all of us, through him, that is to say, through belief and obedience of what he taught, an access unto the Father, an assurance of his forgiveness of us, and of our reconciliation with him. By becoming Christians, we may enter upon the experience of that true life which is "joy and peace in believing," and which remains indestructible through all the vanishing *vagrancies* of sin, misery, and the world. "This is eternal life, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent"; that is, true, imperishable life, the real and enduring happiness of man, is to be obtained by union with God in faith and love, through a hearty acceptance of the instructions of Christ.

The two points thus far considered are, first, that the sinful, unbelieving, wretched man is morally dead, abides in virtual death, while the righteous, happy believer in the Gospel is truly alive, has the experience of genuine life; and, secondly, that these essential elements of human character and experience survive all events of time and place in everlasting continuance.

The next consideration prominent in the Christian doctrine of death and life is the distinction continually made between the body and the soul. Man is regarded under a twofold aspect, as flesh and spirit,—the one a temporal accompaniment and dependent medium, the other an immortal being in itself. The distinction is a fundamental one, and runs through all philosophy and religion in their reference to man. In the Christian Scriptures it is not sharply drawn, with logical precision, nor always accurately maintained, but is loosely defined, with waving outlines, is often employed carelessly, and sometimes, if strictly taken, inconsistently,—as every competent reader of the Pauline letters knows. Let us

first note a few examples of the distinction itself in the instructions of the Saviour and of the different New Testament writers.

"That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed." "He that soweth to his flesh shall reap corruption, he that soweth to the spirit shall reap life everlasting." "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit." "Knowing that I must shortly put off this tabernacle." "The body without the spirit is dead." It would be useless to accumulate examples. It is plain that these authors distinguish the body and the soul as two things conjoined for a season, the latter of which will continue to live when the other has mixed with the dust. The facts and phenomena of our being from which this distinction springs are so numerous and influential, so profound and so obvious, that it is impossible they should escape the knowledge of any thinking person. Indeed, the distinction has found a recognition everywhere among men, from the ignorant savage, whose instincts and imagination shadow forth a dim world in which the impalpable images of the departed dwell, to the philosopher of piercing intellect and universal culture,

"Whose lore detects beneath our crumbling clay
A soul, exiled, and journeying back to day."

Whether the conclusion be true or not, man naturally believes that the body and the soul are two things, mysteriously united, but essentially distinct. This idea, as we have seen, Christianity adopts, advancing it in diverse forms and with peculiar emphasis. "Labor not for the meat which perisheth," Jesus exhorts his followers, "but labor for the meat which endureth unto everlasting life." The body and the luxury that pampers it shall perish, but the spirit and the love that feeds it shall abide for ever.

We now pass to examine some metaphorical terms, often erroneously interpreted as conveying merely their literal force. To understand this portion of the subject clearly, it will be necessary to dwell upon it in different lights, and somewhat in detail. Every one familiar with

the language of the New Testament must remember how repeatedly the body and the soul, or the flesh and the spirit, are set in direct opposition to each other, sin being referred to the former, righteousness to the latter. "I know that in my flesh there is no good thing, but with my mind I delight in the law of God." "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit lusteth against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other." All this language—and it is extensively used in the Epistles—is quite generally understood in a fixed, literal sense, whereas it was employed by its authors in a fluctuating, figurative sense, as the unprejudiced critical student can hardly help perceiving. We will state the real substance of Christian teaching and phraseology on this point in two general formulas, which we will then proceed to sustain and illustrate. First, both the body and the soul may be corrupt, lawless, empty of divine belief, full of restlessness and suffering, in a state of moral death; or both may be pure, obedient, acceptable in the sight of God, full of faith, peace, and joy, in a state of genuine life. Secondly, whatever tends in any way to the former result, to make man guilty, feeble, and wretched, to deaden his spiritual sensibilities, to keep him from union with God and from immortal reliances, is variously personified as "the Flesh," "Sin," "Death," "Mammon," "the World," "the Law of the Members," "the Law of Sin and Death"; whatever, on the contrary, tends in any way to the latter result, to purify man, intensify his moral powers, exalt and quicken his consciousness in the assurance of the favor of God and of eternal being, is personified as "the Spirit," "Life," "Righteousness," "the Law of God," "the Law of the Inward Man," "Christ," "the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ." Under the first class of terms are included all the temptations and agencies by which man is led to sin, and the results of misery they effect; under the second class are included all the aspirations and influences by which he is led to righteousness, and the results of happiness they insure. For example, it is written, in the Epistle to the Galatians, that "the manifest works of the flesh are excessive sensuality, idolatry, hatred, emulations, quarrels, heresies, murders, and such like." Certainly, some of these evils are more connected with the mind than with the body. The term *flesh* is

obviously used in a sense coextensive with the tendencies and means by which we are exposed to guilt and degradation. These personifications, it will therefore be seen, are employed with general rhetorical looseness, not with definite logical exactness.

It is self-evident that the mind is the actual agent and author of all sins and virtues, and that the body, in itself, is unconscious, irresponsible, incapable of guilt. "Every sin that man doeth is without the body." In illustration of this point Chrysostom says, "If a tyrant or robber were to seize some royal mansion, it would not be the fault of the house." And how greatly they err who think that any of the New Testament writers mean to represent the flesh as necessarily sinful, and the spirit as always pure, the following cases to the contrary from Paul, whose speech seems most to lean that way, will abundantly show. "Glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are (both) his." "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?" "Yield not your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but as instruments of righteousness unto God." "That the life of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God." It is clear that the author of these sentences did not regard the body, or literal flesh, as necessarily unholy, but as capable of being used by the man himself in fulfilling the will of God. Texts that appear to contradict this must be held as figures, or as impassioned rhetorical exclamations. We also read of "the lusts of the mind," the "fleshy mind," "filthiness of the spirit," "seducing spirits," "corrupt minds," "mind and conscience defiled," "reprobate mind," — showing plainly that the spirit was sometimes regarded as guilty and morally dead. Finally, the Apostle writes, "I pray that your whole spirit and soul and body may be preserved blameless." The Scriptural declarations now cited explicitly teach that both the body and the soul may be subjected to the perfect law of God, or both may abide in rebellion and wickedness; the latter state being called, metaphorically, "walking after the flesh," the former "walking after the spirit"; that being sin and death, this righteousness and life.

An explanation of the origin of these metaphors will cast further light upon the subject. The use of a por-

tion of them arose from the fact, that many of the most easily besetting and pernicious vices, conditions and allurements of sin, defilements and clogs of the spirit, come through the body, which, while it is itself evidently fated to perish, does by its earthly solicitations entice, contaminate, and debase the soul that by itself is invited to better things and seems destined to immortality. Not that these evils originate in the body, — of course, all the doings of a man spring from the spirit of man which is in him, — but that the body is the occasion and the aggravating medium of their manifestation. This thought is not contradicted, only omitted, in the words of Peter, — “I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul.” For such language would be spontaneously suggested by the fact, that to be in bondage to the baser nature is hostile alike to spiritual dignity and peace, and to physical health and strength; a fact which makes the poet’s lines true in a twofold sense: —

“Thy frame a battle-field,
Where every pulse and breath
Bring tidings from the ground
Where life is meeting death.”

The principles of the moral nature are at war with the passions of the animal nature, the goading vices of the mind are at war with the organic harmonies of the body; and on the issues of these conflicts hang all the interests of life and death, in every sense the words can be made to bear.

Another reason for the use of these figures of speech, undoubtedly, was the philosophy of the ineradicable hostility of matter and spirit, the doctrine, so prevalent in the East from the earliest times, that matter is wholly corrupt and evil, the essential root and source of all vileness. An old, unknown Greek poet embodies the very soul of this faith in a few verses which we find in the Anthology. Literally rendered, they run thus: —

The body is the torment, hell, fate, load, tyrant,
Dreadful pest, and punishing trial of the soul,
Which, when it quits the body, flies, as from the bonds
Of death, to immortal God.

It was this idea that produced the wild asceticism prevalent in the Christian Church during the Middle Ages and previously; the fearful macerations, scourgings, cru-

cifixions of the flesh. It should be understood, that, though some of the phraseology of the Scriptures is tinged by the influence of this doctrine, the doctrine itself is foreign to Christianity. Christ came eating and drinking, not abjuring nature, but adopting its teachings, viewing it as a divine work through which the providence of God is displayed and his glory gleams. The Apostles never recommend self-inflicted torments. The ascetic expressions found in their letters grew directly out of the perils besetting them, and their expectation of the speedy end of the world. Christianity, rightly understood, renders even the body of a good man sacred and precious, through the indwelling of the Infinite. "We have this treasure in earthen vessels," and the poor, dying tenement of flesh is hallowed as

"A vase of earth, a trembling clod,
Constrained to hold the breath of God."

The chief secret, however, of the origin of the peculiar phrases under consideration consisted in their striking fitness to the nature and facts of the case, their adaptedness to express these facts in a bold and vivid manner. The revelation of the transcendent claims of holiness, of the pardoning love of God, of the splendid boon of immortality, made by Christ and enforced by the miraculous sanctions and the kindling motives presented in his example, thrilled the souls of the first converts, shamed them of their degrading sins, opened before their imaginations a vision that paled the glories of the world, and regenerated them, stirring up the depths of their religious sensibilities, and flooding their whole being with a warmth, an energy, a spirituality, that made their previous experience seem a gross carnal slumber, a virtual death. "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." They were animated and raised to a new, pure, glad life, through the feeling of the hopes and the practice of the virtues of the Gospel of Christ. Unto those who "were formerly in the flesh, the servants of sin, bringing forth fruit unto death," but now obeying the new form of doctrine delivered unto them, with renewed hearts and changed conduct, it is written, "If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness." That is, if Christian truth reign in you, the body

may still be tormented, or powerless, owing to your previous bad habits; but the soul will be redeemed from its abandonment to error and vice, and be assured of pardon and immortal life by the witnessing spirit of God.

The Apostle also tells them, that, "If the spirit of God dwell in you, it shall also quicken your mortal bodies." This remarkable expression was meant to convey a thought which the observation of common facts approves and explains. If the love of the pure principles of the Gospel was established in them, their bodies, debilitated and deadened by former abandonment to their lusts, should be freed and reanimated by its influence. The body to a great extent reflects the permanent mind and life of a man. It is an aphorism of Solomon, that "A sound heart is the life of the flesh." And Plotinus declares, "Temperance and justice are the saviours of the body so far as they are received by it." Deficiency of thought and knowledge, laziness of spirit, animality of habits, betray themselves plainly enough in the state and expression of the physical frame; they render it coarse, nerveless, dim, unmeaning, heavy, and insensible; the person verges towards the condition of a clod, spiritual things are clouded, the beacon-fire of his destiny wanes, the possibilities of Christian faith lessen, "the external and the insensate creep in on his organized clay," he feels the chain of the brute earth more and more, and finally gives himself up to utter death. On the other hand, the reception and assimilation of divine truth and goodness by a man, the cherishing fulfilment and love of all high duties and aspirations, exert a purifying, energizing power both on the flesh and the mind, animate and strengthen them, like a heavenly flame burn away the defiling entanglements and the spiritual fogs that fill and hang around the wicked and sensual, increasingly pervade his consciousness with an inspired force and freedom, illuminate his face, touch the magnetic springs of health and healthful sympathy, make him completely alive, and bring him into living connection with the Omnipresent Life, so that he perceives the full testimony that he shall never die. For, when brought into such a state by the experience of live spirits in live frames,

"We feel through all this fleshly dresse
Bright shootes of everlastingnesse."

Spiritual sloth and sensual indulgence stupefy and blunt,

and confuse together in lifeless meshes the vital tenant and the mortal tenement; they grow incorporate, alike unclean, powerless, guilty, and wretched, —

"To live a life half dead, a living death,
Himself his sepulchre, a moving grave."

Active, thorough virtue, profound love, and the earnest, pious pursuit in the daily duties of life of

"Those lofty musings which within us sow
The seeds of higher kind and brighter being,"

cleanse, vivify, and distinguish the body and the soul, so that when this tabernacle of clay crumbles from around us the unimprisoned spirit soars into the universe at once, and, looking back upon the shadowy king bearing his pale prey to the tomb, exclaims, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" The facts, then, of sin, guilt, weakness, misery, unbelief, decay, insensibility, and death, joined with the opposite corresponding class of facts, and considered in their mutual spiritual and physical relations and results, originally suggested, and now interpret and justify, that peculiar phraseology of the New Testament which we have been investigating. It has no recondite meaning drawn from arbitrary dogmas, but a plain meaning drawn from natural truths.

It remains next to see what is the Christian doctrine concerning literal, physical death,—the actual origin and significance of that solemn event. This point must be treated the more at length on account of the erroneous notions prevailing upon the subject. For that man's first disobedience was the procuring cause of organic, as well as of moral death, is a doctrine quite generally believed, even at the present day. It is a fundamental article in the creeds of all the principal denominations of Christendom, and is traditionally held, from the neglect of investigation, by nearly all Christians. By this theory, the words of James, who writes, "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death," are interpreted with strict literalness. It is conceived that a physical immortality on the earth was the original destination of man. Had not evil entered his heart, and caused him to fall from his native innocence, he would have roamed among the flowers of Eden to this day. But he violated the

commandment of his Maker, and sentence of death was passed upon him and his posterity to the latest generation. We are now to prove, that this imaginative theory is far from the truth; that natural death is not the result of sin, but a part of God's plan from the commencement; that according to the philosophy unfolded in the New Testament, conscious holiness is, to a Christian believer, peace, joy, union with God, life,—that is, a sense of blessed being; while conscious guilt is unrest, suffering, alienation from God, death,—that is, moral lethargy and essential misery.

The language in which the original account of Adam's sin and its punishment is stated, shows conclusively that the penalty of transgression was not literal death, but spiritual, that is, degradation, suffering. God's warning in relation to the forbidden tree was, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Of course, Jehovah's solemn declaration was fulfilled as he had said. But in the day that man partook of the prohibited fruit, he did not die a physical death. He lived, driven from the delights of Paradise, upwards of eight hundred years, earning his bread by the sweat of his brow. Consequently, the death with which he had been threatened must have been a moral death, loss of innocence and joy, experience of guilt and woe.

The common usage of the words connected with this subject in the New Testament still more clearly substantiates the view just taken of it. There is a class of words, linked together by similarity of meaning and closeness of mutual relation, often used by the Christian writers loosely, figuratively, and sometimes interchangeably,—as has been shown already in another connection. We mean the words sin, flesh, misery, death. The same remark may be made of another class of words of precisely opposite signification,—righteousness, faith, life, blessedness, eternal life. These different words frequently stand to represent the same idea. "As the law hath reigned through sin unto death, so shall grace reign through righteousness unto life." In other terms, as the recognition of the retributive law of God through rebellion and guilt filled the consciences of men with wretchedness, so the acceptance of the pardoning love of God through faith and conformity will fill them with blessed-

ness. Sin includes conscious disobedience and alienation; righteousness includes conscious obedience and reconciliation. Sin and death, it will be seen, are related just as righteousness and life are. The fact that they are sometimes represented in the relation of identity, — “the minding of the flesh is death, but the minding of the spirit is life,” — and sometimes in the relation of cause and effect, — “the fruit of sin is death, the fruit of righteousness is life,” — proves that the words are used metaphorically, and really mean conscious guilt and misery, conscious virtue and blessedness. No other view is consistent. We are urged to be “dead unto sin, but alive unto God”; that is, to be in a state of moral perfection which turns a deaf and invincible front to all the influences of evil, but is open and joyfully sensitive to every thing good and holy. Paul also wrote, in his letter to the Philippians, that he had “not yet attained unto the resurrection,” but was striving to attain unto it; that is, he had not yet reached, but was striving to reach, that lofty state of holiness and peace invulnerable to sin, which no change can injure, with which the event of bodily dissolution cannot interfere, because its elements — faith, truth, justice, and love — are the immutable principles of everlasting life.

In confirmation of this conclusion, an argument amounting wellnigh to positive certainty is afforded by the way in which the disobedience of Adam and its consequences, and the obedience of Christ and its consequences, are spoken of together; by the way in which a sort of antithetical parallel is drawn between the result of Adam's fall and the result of Christ's mission. “As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men; so much more shall all receive the gift of God by one man, Jesus Christ, and reign unto eternal life.” This means, as the writer himself afterwards explains, that, “as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners,” and suffered the consequences of sin, figuratively expressed by the word death, “so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous,” and enjoy the consequences of righteousness, figuratively expressed by the word life. Give the principal terms in this passage their literal force, and no meaning which is not absolutely incompatible with the plain-

est truths can be drawn from it. Surely literal death had come equally and fully upon all men everywhere, literal life could do no more. But render the idea in this way, — the blessedness offered to men in the revelation of grace made by Jesus outweighs the wretchedness brought upon them through the sin introduced by Adam, — and the sense is satisfactory. That which Adam is represented as having lost, that, the Apostle affirms, Christ restored; that which Adam is said to have incurred, that Christ is said to have removed. But Christ did not restore to man a physical immortality on the earth; therefore that is not what Adam forfeited, but he lost peace of conscience and trust in the Divine favor. Furthermore, Christ did not free his followers from natural decay and death; therefore that is not what Adam's transgression brought upon his children, but it entailed upon them proclivities to evil, spiritual unrest, and woe. The basis of the comparison is evidently this: Adam's disobedience showed that the consequences of sin, through the stern operation of the law, were strife, despair, and misery, all of which is implied in the New Testament usage of the word death; Christ's obedience showed that the consequences of righteousness, through the free grace of God, were faith, peace, and indestructible happiness, all of which is implied in the New Testament usage of the word life. In the mind of Paul there was undoubtedly an additional thought, connecting the descent of the soul to the underworld with the death of the sinful Adam, and its ascent to heaven with the resurrection of the immaculate Christ; but this does not touch the argument just advanced, because it does not refer to the *cause* of physical dissolution, but to what followed that event.

It will not be out of place here to demonstrate that sin actually was not the origin of natural decay, by the revelations of science, which prove that death was a monarch on the earth for ages before moral transgression was known. As the geologist wanders, and studies the records of nature, where earthquake, deluge, and volcano have exposed the structure of the globe and its organic remains in strata piled on strata, upon these, as upon so many pages of the earth's autobiography, he reads the history of a hundred races of animals which lived and died, leaving their bones layer above layer, in regular succession, centuries before the existence of man. It is

evident, then, that independent of human guilt, and from the very first, the mechanical and chemical laws were in force, waging their cumulative conflict against the vital functions, and death was a part of God's plan in the material creation. As the previous animals perished without sin, so without sin the animal part of man too would have died. It was made perishable from the outset. The important point just here in the theology of Paul was, as previously implied, that death was intended to lead the soul directly to heaven in a new "spiritual body," or "heavenly house"; but sin marred the plan, and doomed the soul to go into the under-world a naked *manes* when "unclothed" of "the natural body" or "earthly house." The mission of Christ was to restore the original plan, and would be consummated at his second coming.

There is a gross absurdity involved in the supposition, that an earthly immortality was the intended destiny of man. That supposition necessarily implies that the whole groundwork of God's first design was a failure, that his great purpose was thwarted and changed into one wholly different. And it is absurd to think such a result possible in the providence of the Almighty. Nor is this theory free from another, still more palpable absurdity; for had there been no interference of death, to remove one generation and make room for another, the world could not support the multitudes with which it would now swarm. Moreover, the time would arrive when the earth could not only not afford sustenance to its so numerous inhabitants, but could not even contain them. So that if this were the original arrangement, unless certain other parts which were indisputable portions of it were cancelled, the surplus myriads would have to be removed to some other world. That is just what death accomplishes. Consequently death was a part of God's primal plan, and not a contingency accidentally caused by sin.

If death be the result of sin, then, of course, it is a punishment inflicted upon man for his wickedness. In fact, this is an identical proposition. But death cannot be intended as a punishment, because, viewed in that light, it is unjust. It comes equally upon old and young, good and bad, joyous and wretched. It does not permit

the best man to live longest; it does not come with the greatest terror and agony to the most guilty. All these things depend on a thousand contingencies strung upon an iron law, which inheres to the physical world of necessity, and has not its basis and action in the spiritual sphere of freedom, character, and experience. The innocent babe and the hardened criminal are struck at the same instant and die the same death. Solomon knew this when he said, "As dieth the fool, so the wise man dieth." Death regarded as a retribution for sin is unjust, because it is destitute of moral discrimination. It therefore is not a consequence of transgression, but an era, incident, and step in human existence, an established part of the visible order of things from the beginning. When the New Testament speaks of death as a punishment, it always uses the word in a symbolic sense, meaning spiritual deadness and misery, which is a perfect retribution, because it discriminates with unerring exactness. Milton justly remarks, in his *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, — "Under the head of death, in Scripture, all evils whatever must be understood as comprehended."

Finally, natural death cannot be the penalty of unrighteousness, because it is not a curse and a woe, but a blessing and a privilege. It cannot be the effect of man's sin, because it is the improvement of man's condition. Who can believe it would be better for man to remain on earth for ever, under any circumstances, than it is for him to go to heaven to such an experience as the faithful follower of Christ supposes is there awaiting him? It is not to be thought by us that death is a frowning enemy thrusting us into the gloom of eternal night or into the flaming waves of irremedial torment, but rather a smiling friend ushering us into the endless life of the spiritual world and into the unveiled presence of God. According to the arrangement and desire of God, for us to die is gain; every personal exception to this, if there be any exception, is caused through the marring interference of personal wickedness with the Creator's intention and with natural order. Who has not sometimes felt the bondage of the body and the trials of earth, and peered with awful thrills of curiosity into the mysteries of the unseen world, until he has longed for the hour of the soul's liberation, that it might plume itself for an

immortal flight? Who has not experienced moments of serene faith, in which he could hardly help exclaiming, —

“ I would not live away, I ask not to stay :
O, who would live away from his God ? ”

A favorite of Apollo prayed for the best gift Heaven could bestow upon man. The god said, “ At the end of seven days it shall be granted ; in the mean time, live happy.” At the appointed hour he fell into a sweet slumber, from which he never awoke. He who regards death as upon the whole an evil does not take the Christian’s view of it, not even the enlightened pagan’s view, but the frightened sensualist’s view, the superstitious atheist’s view. And if death be upon the whole normally a blessing, then assuredly it cannot be a punishment brought upon man by sin.

The New Testament does not teach that natural death, organic separation, is the fruit of sin ; that, if man had not sinned, he would have lived for ever on the earth. This doctrine is false too. But it does teach that moral death, misery, is the consequence of violated law ; that sin is the origin of suffering. And that is a profound truth which it behooves us to understand. The great first fountain of suffering is guilt. The sting of death is the law, the condition and life of remorse is the consciousness of a divine obligation voluntarily set at naught. The pains and afflictions which sometimes come upon the good without fault of theirs do yet spring from human faults somewhere, with those exceptions alone that result from the necessary contingencies of finite creatures, exposures outside the sphere of human accountability. With this small qualification, it would be easy to show in detail that the sufferings of the private individual, and of mankind at large, are directly or indirectly the products of sins. All the woes, for instance, of poverty are the results of selfishness, pride, ignorance, and vice. And it is the same with every other class of miseries.

“ The world in titanic immortality
Writhe beneath the burning mountain of its sins.”

Sin is the nethermost source of suffering. Had there been no sin, men’s lives would have glided on like the placid rivers that flow through the woodlands. They would have lived without strife or sorrow, grown old

without sadness or satiety, and died without a pang or a sigh. But alas! sin so abounds in the world that "there is not a just man that lives and sins not"; and it is a truth whose omnipresent jurisdiction can neither be avoided nor resisted, that every kind of sin, every offence against divine order, shall somewhere, at some time, be judged just as it deserves. He who denies this only betrays the ignorance which conceals from him a pervading law of inevitable application, only reveals the degradation and insensibility which do not allow him to be conscious of his own experience or to read intelligently the record of each day's life. A harmonious, happy existence depends on the practice of pure morals and communion with the love of God. This great idea, that the conscientious culture and obedience of the spiritual nature is the sole method of divine life, is equally a fundamental principle of the Gospel and a conclusion of observation and reason; upon the devout observance of it hinge the possibilities of true blessedness. The pursuit of an opposite course necessitates the opposite experience, makes its votary a restless, wretched slave, wishing for freedom but unable to obtain it.

The thought just stated, we maintain, strikes the keynote of the Christian Scriptures; and the voices of truth and nature, we repeat, accord with it. That Christianity declares sin to be the cause of spiritual death, in all the deep and wide meaning of the term, has been fully shown; that this is also a fact in the great order of things has been partially illustrated, but in justice to the subject should be urged in a more precise and adequate form. In the first place, there is a positive punishment flowing evidently from sin, consisting both in outward inflictions of suffering and disgrace through human laws and social customs, and in the private endurance of bodily and mental pains and of strange misgivings that load the soul with fear and anguish. Subjection to the animal nature in the obedience of unrighteousness sensibly tends to bring upon its victim a woful mass of positive ills, public and personal, to put him under the vile tyranny of devouring lusts, to induce death-like enervation and disease in his whole being, to pervade his consciousness with the wretched gnawings of remorse and shame, and the timorous, tormenting sense of guilt, discord, alienation, and condemnation.

In the second place, there is a negative punishment for impurity and wrong-doing, less gross and visible than the former, but equally real and much more to be dreaded. Sin snatches from a man the prerogatives of eternal life, by brutalizing and deadening his nature, sinking the spirit with its delicate delights in the body and its coarse satisfactions, making him insensible to his highest good and glory, lowering him in the scale of being away from God, shutting the gates of heaven against him, and leaving him to wallow in the mire. The wages of sin is misery, and its gift is a degradation which prevents any elevation to true happiness. These positive and negative retributions, however delayed or disguised, will come where they are deserved, and will not fail. Do a wrong deed from a bad motive, and though you fled on the pinions of the inconceivable lightning from one end of infinite space to the other, the fated penalty would chase you through eternity but that you should pay its debt; or rather, the penalty is grappling with you from within on the instant, — is a part of you.

Thirdly, if, by the searing of his conscience and absorption in the world, a sinner escapes for a season the penal consequences threatened in the law, and does not know how miserable he is, and thinks he is happy, yet let him remember that the remedial, restorative process through which he must pass, either in this life or in the next, involves a concentrated experience of expiatory pangs, as is shown both by the reason of the thing and by all relevant analogies. When the bad man awakes, as some time or other he will awake, to the infinite perfections and unalterable love of the Father whose holy commands he has trampled and whose kind invitations he has spurned, he will suffer agonies of remorseful sorrow but faintly shadowed in the bitterness of Peter's tears when his forgiving Master looked on him. Such is the common deadness of our consciences, that the vices of our corrupt characters are far from appearing to us as the terrific things they really are. Angels looking under the fleshly garment we wear, and seeing a falsehood or a sin assimilated as a portion of our being, turn away with such feeling as we should experience at beholding a leprous sore beneath the lifted ermine of a king. A well-taught Christian will not fail to contemplate physi-

cal death as a stupendous, awakening crisis, one of whose chief effects will be the opening to personal consciousness, in the most vivid manner, of all the realities of character, their relations towards things above and things below himself. And when this is done, surely there will be no need of arbitrary inflictions of vengeance or bestowments of approbation!

This thought leads us to a fourth and final consideration, more important than the previous. The tremendous fact, that all the inwrought elements and workings of our being are self-retributive, their own exceeding great and sufficient good or evil independent of external circumstances and sequences, is rarely appreciated. Men overlook it in their superficial search after associations, accompaniments, and effects. When all tangible punishments and rewards are wanting, all outward penalties and prizes fail, if we go a little deeper into the mysterious facts of experience we shall find that still goodness is rewarded and evil is punished, because "the mind is its own place, and can itself," if virtuous, "make a heaven of hell," if wicked, "a hell of heaven." It is a truth, springing from the very nature of God and his irreversible relations towards his creatures, that his united justice and love shall follow both holiness and iniquity now and ever, pouring his beneficence upon them to be converted by them into their food and bliss or into their bane and misery. There is, then, no essential need of adventitious accompaniments or results to justify and pay the good, or to condemn and torture the bad, here or hereafter. To be wise and pure and strong and noble is glory and blessedness enough in itself. To be ignorant and corrupt and mean and feeble is degradation and horror enough in itself. The one abides in true life, the other in moral death, and that is sufficient. Even now, in this world, therefore, the swift and diversified retributions of men's characters and lives are in them and upon them in various ways and to a much greater extent than they are accustomed to think. No good man will deny this, and no wise man can question it. History preaches it with all her solemn, revealing voices. Philosophy lays it bare, and points every finger at the flaming bond that binds innocence to peace, guilt to remorse. It is the very substance of the Gospel, emphatically and repeat-

edly pronounced and applied. And the clear experience of every sensitive soul confirms its truth, echoing through the silent corridors of the conscience the declarations which fell in ancient Judea from the lips of Jesus and the pen of Paul, "The pure in heart shall see God," — "The wages of sin is death."

We will briefly sum up the principal positions of the ground we have now traversed. That to be enslaved by the senses in the violation of the Divine laws, neglecting the mind and abusing the members, is to be dead to the goodness of God, the joys of virtue, and the hopes of heaven, and alive to guilt, anguish, and despair; — that to obey the will of God in love, keeping the body under, and cherishing a pure soul, is to be dead to the evil of the world, the goading of passions, and the fears of punishment, and alive to innocence, happiness, and faith; — that, according to the natural plan of things from the creation, the flesh was intended to fall into the ground, but the spirit to rise into heaven; — that suffering is the retributive result and accumulated merit of iniquity, while enjoyment is the gift of God, and the fruit of conformity to his law; — that to receive the instructions of Christ and obey them with the whole heart, walking after his example, is to be quickened from that deadly misery into this living blessedness; — that the inner life of truth and goodness thus revealed and proposed to men, its personal experience being once obtained, is an immortal possession, a conscious fount springing up unto eternity through the beneficent decree of the Father, to play for ever in the light of his smile and the shadow of his arm; — such are the great component elements of the Christian doctrine of sin and death, righteousness and eternal life.

Of course we are far from claiming for this article that it is a worthy discussion, or a full presentation, of the general subject of the eschatology of the 'New Testament. The adequate treatment of that entire theme implies three lines of investigation. The first is the pure declarations of Jesus himself. The second is the Pharisaic, and the distinctive, opinions of the Apostles. The third is the purpose, value, and consequences of the resurrection of Christ. We have here merely aimed to present and illustrate the interior essential meaning and agreement of their various doctrines.

W. R. A.

cal death as a stupendous, awakened whose chief effects will be the open consciousness, in the most vivid manner of character, their relations towards things below himself. And when there will be no need of arbitrary inflictions or bestowments of approbation!

This thought leads us to a fourth notion, more important than the previous fact, that all the inwrought elements of our being are self-retributive, the great and sufficient good or evil independent circumstances and sequences, is rarely to overlook it in their superficial search for accompaniments, and effects. When punishments and rewards are wanting, all and prizes fail, if we go a little deeper into facts of experience we shall find that is rewarded and evil is punished, because its own place, and can itself," if virtuous, "a hell of hell," if wicked, "a hell of heaven," springing from the very nature of God in his relations towards his creatures, that his love and shall follow both holiness and ever, pouring his beneficence upon them, and verted by them into their food and bliss and bane and misery. There is, then, no essential adventitious accompaniments or results to pay the good, or to condemn and torture or hereafter. To be wise and pure and strong is glory and blessedness enough in itself. To be and corrupt and mean and feeble is degradation and horror enough in itself. The one abides in the other in moral death, and that is sufficient. In this world, therefore, the swift and diversified variety of men's characters and lives are in various ways and to a much greater extent are accustomed to think. No good man and no wise man can question the truth with all her solemn, revealing voice, it binds innocence to the very substance

[Faint, illegible text from the reverse side of the page, appearing as bleed-through.]

ll with us, thou worthy,
Spirit of God I
rter, who teachest
his Christ hath trod !

wisdom's fulness,
s exalted might,
love revealing
eth all things right ! ”

y all have risen, —
vide open fly, —
alls to combat :
manfully !

glittering phalanx
s a champion proud,
e, and piercing
ings through the crowd : —

with me to battle ?
runtlet down ! ”
attembergers
o meet his frown.

ne another, —
s flash to and fro, —
thrust and parry, —
the sturdy blow.

kes his foeman
ground.— Come, thou,
ger's master,
ena now !

n of Jesse,
k takes the field ;
nor helmet, —
sword nor shield.

t bears he
oodly stone, —
s to sling them,
ough brass and bone.

se so bravely, —
viantly, —
hat assembly
in terror see.

ART. VI. — POETRY.

THE LEIPSIC TOURNAMENT.

TRANSLATION OF AN OLD GERMAN BALLAD.

[“ On the 24th of June, the Wittembergers arrived ; the professors in low, open wagons, around them, on foot, some hundreds of zealous students armed with halberds, battle-axes, and spears. The Duke ordered a spacious hall in the castle to be got ready for the literary duel ; two pulpits were placed opposite to each other, covered with tapestry, on which were the figures of the warrior-saints, St. George and St. Martin. At length, on the 27th of June, the action was commenced with a mass and invocation of the Holy Ghost. Carletadt had insisted on his right of opening the debate, but he acquired little glory from it. Eck was tall, with large, muscular limbs, and loud, penetrating voice. On Monday, the 4th of July, at seven in the morning, Luther arose ; he even, on this grave occasion, ascended the platform with a nosegay in his hand.” — *Extracts from Ranke's History of the Reformation.*]

In Leipsic's famous city —
 In Leipsic's castle-hall —
 Are seen brave warriors mustering,
 With armed retainers all.

In march the Wittembergers, —
 Their halberds bristling see !
 They mean around their master
 A storm-proof wall to be.

But he, — no lance he beareth,
 Nor sword nor spear doth wield, —
 The Word of God 's his weapon,
 The Spirit is his shield.

Hark ! sounds no blast of trumpets
 The signal to the fight ?
 No ! to the holy combat
 Sweet organ-tones invite.

Down on their knees all sinking,
 Their manly forms they bow ;
 They pray high Heaven to send them
 The Holy Spirit now.

“Come, dwell with us, thou worthy,
Thou holy Spirit of God!
Thou Comforter, who teachest
The path his Christ hath trod!

“O, give us wisdom’s fulness,
And faith’s exalted might,
The truth in love revealing
That worketh all things right!”

And now they all have risen, —
The lists wide open fly, —
The herald calls to combat:
Now battle manfully!

From yonder glittering phalanx
Forth stalks a champion proud,
Of giant frame, and piercing
His voice rings through the crowd: —

“Who dares with me to battle?
I fling my gauntlet down!”
One of the Wittembergers
Has dared to meet his frown.

They run at one another, —
Their swords flash to and fro, —
They cut and thrust and parry, —
Loud sounds the sturdy blow.

Yet neither strikes his foeman
Quite to the ground. — Come, thou,
The Wittemberger’s master,
Out on th’ arena now!

And, like the son of Jesse,
A young monk takes the field;
No lance has he nor helmet, —
He bears no sword nor shield.

But in his wallet bears he
Full many a goodly stone, —
So well he knows to sling them,
They crash through brass and bone.

He bears his cause so bravely, —
He fights so valiantly, —
The knights in that assembly
His deeds with terror see.

The blows, — they thicken round him,
 And clip and clap they fall,
 But from his frame as nimbly
 They fly off, one and all.

“ The master on his finger
 A little ring doth wear,
 And holds, by art of magic,
 An evil spirit there ! ”

Thus through the knightly circle
 Suspicious whispers fly :
 “ Come out, thou evil spirit !
 Out from the ring ! ” they cry.

“ The master hath a nosegay
 He in his hand doth bear,
 And holds, by art of magic,
 An evil spirit there ! ”

“ Come out, then, from the nosegay,
 Foul fiend ! ” they cry once more ; —
 The ring and eke the nosegay
 Are what they were before.

Now let me say, my masters !
 It is not in the ring,
 And as to imps in nosegays,
 ’T is all a foolish thing.

Know, when the Lord of Spirits
 His servant aids in fight,
 Then needs a noble warrior
 No alien spirit’s might.

The Lord from heaven’s the spirit
 That lends true strength, and He
 Hath to our master given
 Courage and victory.

THE LOSS OF THE ANIO.

FROM THE FRENCH OF LAMARTINE.

HERE had I mused and dreamed in days of yore,
 Lulled by the sound of many a cascade’s roar,
 Couched on the turf that Horace once had trod,
 Shaded by old arcades that cool the sod,

And fanned by each fresh air that lightly creeps
 Where, 'neath her crumbling fane, the Sibyl sleeps ; —
 Had seen the torrent plunge through grove and cave,
 Where floating Iris sported on the wave,
 As the wind sports with the wild steed's white mane,
 That cuts the air upon the desert plain ; —
 Had seen it, farther on, all foam and froth,
 Spread o'er the moss its strips of smoking cloth,
 Expand, contract its flickering, watery nets,
 Fling o'er the turf its veil, in fitful jets,
 And, filling the ravine with din and dust of spray,
 In billowings of light pursue its distant way !

My eyes, all day, suspended on its waves,
 Pursued, o'ertook, then lost them in their graves,
 As when, from thought to thought, the baffled mind,
 Borne on, returns in vain their trace to find ;
 I saw them mount, roll on, vanish away, —
 I loved the dazzling of their brilliant play.
 Methought I saw the glory-streaming rays,
 The Eternal City wore in olden days,
 Back to their source ascend, through time's long night,
 And crown, once more, old Tibur's classic height ;
 And, listening the sublime, majestic sound
 Of waves that thundered down the vast profound,
 In those convulsions, murmurs, shouts that rolled,
 By echo multiplied a hundredfold,
 I seemed to hear, across the wastes of time,
 A mighty people's voice and step sublime,
 Who, like these waves, but more direct than they,
 Shook with their tramp these banks, and disappeared for aye. . . .

O stream ! I cried, whose shores the early beam
 Of empire gilded and its evening gleam !
 Whose memory, by a humble freedman sung,
 In every age and clime hath found a tongue !
 Beside whose wave the world's oppressors sought
 Rest, in its murmurs, from tormenting thought,*
 Tibullus, in his love-lorn strains, complained,
 Scipio the rods of lictorship disdained,
 Cæsar sought refuge from the noise of fame,
 Mæcenas begged the poets for a name,
 Brutus nursed crime's, and Cato virtue's dream, —
 What dost thou say to me, thou myriad-voicèd stream ?

* It is an historical fact, that Mæcenas, in the latter part of his life, could not sleep excepting at Tibur, in the murmur of its cascades.

Tones from the lyre of Horace dost thou bring ?
 Or Cæsar's voice — now sternly menacing,
 Now soft with flattery — dost thou bid me hear ?
 Or with a stormy Forum stun my ear,
 Where a heroic, high-souled people, stirred
 And stung to frenzy by a tribune's word,
 And onward, like thy waves, in fury hurled,
 O'erleaped its narrow banks and whelmed the world ?

Ah no ! these sounds are gone, beyond recall !
 Field, forum, lyre, and love are silent all !
 'T is but a wave I hear, that sighs and weeps,
 'T is but thy plunge, down o'er the murmuring steeps !
 What say I ? Once they murmured, — but 't is o'er ;
 The bed is dry, — the stream is there no more !
 Each pendent rock, — each empty cave and cleft, —
 These trees, of all their liquid pearls bereft, —
 The bird, the wandering heifer and the hind,
 That on thy rocks no drop of moisture find, —
 Vainly they wait till the lost wave restore
 Life's music to the silent vale once more, —
 And, in their naked, lonely aspect, see !
 They seem to speak and say, " All 's vanity ! "

Ah ! need we wonder that no empire stands ?
 That the works crumble of man's feeble hands ?
 When that which Nature's self had made for aye
 Must yield, like mortal things, to slow decay !
 When foaming streams, that ages saw roll by,
 Shrink all at once and leave their channels dry !
 A stream has vanished ! But these thrones of day,
 These giant mountains, too, shall pass away ;
 These heavens themselves, sowed with their shining sand, —
 Their lights all quenched, — a gloomy void shall stand ;
 Ay, space itself, one day, shall fade from mind,
 And leave, of all that was, no trace behind.

No trace of all that was ! But Thou, O Lord !
 Source of the worlds, whose everlasting Word
 Kindleth yon flames on high in heaven that glow,
 Who bidd'st these earthly waters gush and flow,
 And days revolve on time's unresting pole,
 Thou — Thou shalt be, unchanged, when ages cease to roll !
 All these quenched orbs, these waters dried away,
 These hills, these worlds that crumble to decay,
 These ages laid in time's vast funeral urn,
 This time, itself, and space, expiring in their turn,

This power that mocks the forms its hand contrives,—
 All render praise to Him who all survives,
 And every mortal thing that ceased to be
 Adds one more hymn to Thy Eternity!

Italia! weep, ah! weep thy hills that rise,
 Where the world's history writ in ruins lies!
 Where empire, as it passed from clime to clime,
 Left the first impress of its march sublime!
 Where glory, who thy name her emblem made,
 Hath in a lustrous veil thy nakedness arrayed.
 Behold, where thy most speaking relic lies!
 Weep! Pity's voice shall answer to thy cries!
 O hallowed by thy fame and by thy fall,
 Great source of nations, mother, queen of all!
 Not those brave sons alone thy sorrows mourn,
 Whom, in its loins, thy green old age hath borne;
 Thy foes, themselves, revere thy envied worth,
 All greatness in thy shadow claims its birth!
 The restless mind, that up the classic mount
 Would climb to liberty's and glory's fount,
 And the meek soul that, bathed in purer day,
 Disdains ambition's gods and scorns their sway,
 And takes a loftier flight and heavenward soars
 To Him, the one, true God whom Faith adores,—
 Both with full hearts, and many a bitter tear,
 Thee "Mother" call and in thy dust revere!
 The wind that scatters thy exposed remains
 Insults thy glory and our grief profanes!
 Each relic, by a Roman plough laid bare,
 Exhales a great man's ghost upon the air;
 And at that lofty shrine, where sits above
 The Christian's God, throned on the wreck of Jove,
 There each who enters prays, and, praying, feels:
 Thy house belongs to each who humbly kneels!

Each tree that on thy glorious ridges dies,
 Each quarried rock, each urn that empty lies,
 Each flower the share cuts down by old tomb-walls,
 Each stone that from thy sacred ruins falls,
 Sounds to the heart of nations like a crime,—
 A blow more daring from the axe of Time!
 And all that wrongs thy sovereign majesty
 Seems to degrade ourselves as well as thee!
 On thy misfortunes double reverence waits,
 Thy name each heart, thy look each eye dilates!
 Thy sun, for meaner eyes too dazzling-bright,
 Seems to shed glory on thee with his light;

And the white sail, that homeward skims thy seas,
 Whence once again it feels the soft land-breeze,
 And when thy great horizon it descries,
 Lifting and looming through the far blue skies,
 With trembling hails these images once more
 And drops, itself, on touching thy dear shore !

Ah ! guard full long, thou widow of the nations !
 For the respect of coming generations,
 These mutilated titles of man's greatness,
 Found at thy feet in Rome's wide smouldering desolateness !
 All that is thine — thy very rags — hold dear !
 Nor, envious, look where brighter hopes appear !
 But, like great Cæsar, when his hour drew nigh,
 Folding his bloody mantle round, to die,
 Whate'er the future has in store for thee,
 Fold round thee, land, thy mighty memory !
 What matters it how empire's die is cast ?
 There is no future that can match thy past !

IN MEMORY OF F. W. R.

[In her last days she requested that the only inscription on her gravestone might be her Christian name, her age, and the words, "Thou art not lost to us, but only gone before."]

BLEST thought ! and, O, how sweet
 To hear thy spirit, from the heavenly shore,
 That strain of angel-music still repeat :
 " Not lost, but gone before ! "

" Thou *art* not lost to us," and heaven has now
 One angel more !
 Death sealed it on thy cold, but radiant brow :
 " Not lost, but gone before ! "

Lost ! who could dream the thought,
 That saw the look thy dying features wore ?
 That look, that heavenly smile, the truth has taught :
 " Not lost, but gone before ! "

'T is not for thee, — O, not for thee we weep !
 But ah ! with loneliness our hearts are sore,
 E'en while we read, where thy dear relics sleep :
 " Not lost, but gone before ! "

" Not lost, but gone before,"
 An angel whispers where the record lies ;

“Not lost, but gone before,”
A choir of angels answers from the skies.

Farewell, sweet spirit! May thy memory teach
Our trusting hearts to wait till time is o'er;
Then shall we, grateful, own, in angel-speech:
“Not lost, but gone before!”

C. T. B.

ART. VII.—EPIDEMIC MONOMANIA.*

M. CALMEIL'S book is well calculated to leave a sober impression upon the mind of the reader. With much labor, he has brought together from the original sources of information very ample accounts of those great epidemics which at various times have afflicted the race, and whose nature has been most grievously misunderstood. Viewing them in the light of modern science, he has unfolded many truths that may well be pondered by the present generation. We could scarcely expect, however, that such a book would be translated, and therefore, that the lesson may not be entirely lost on the English reader, we have thought it might profitably occupy a few of our pages. Without much reference to the order which M. Calmeil has pursued in his inquiries, we shall avail ourselves of the materials he has collected, for the purpose of exposing some of the most prominent points presented by the phenomena in question. In or-

* 1. *De la Folie considérée sous le Point de Vue Pathologique, Philosophique, Historique, et Judiciaire, depuis la Renaissance des Sciences en Europe jusqu'au Dix-neuvième Siècle; Description des grandes Epidémies de Délire simple ou compliqué, qui ont atteint les Populations d'autrefois et régné dans les Monastères. Exposé des Condamnations auxquelles la Folie mécon nue a souvent donné lieu.* Par L. F. CALMEIL, Médecin de la Maison des Aliénés de Charenton, etc. [Insanity considered in its Pathological, Philosophical, Historical, and Judicial Relations, from the Revival of Learning in Europe until the Nineteenth Century; with a Description of those great Epidemic Monomanias, simple or complicated, which have attacked the People and prevailed in Monasteries, and an Account of the Executions to which Insanity misunderstood has frequently led. By L. F. CALMEIL, Physician to the Lunatic Hospital of Charenton.] 2 Vols. 8vo. Paris. 1845.

2. *Sketch of the Epidemic Religious Monomania which occurred in Sweden in the Years 1841 and 1842.* By S. HAMBURY SMITH, M. D. [From the Ohio Medical and Surgical Journal.] Columbus, 1850.

der to measure our own progress, and know exactly where we stand, it is well occasionally to look over the old domain of error by the light of a clearer experience and a sounder philosophy. Because, in the first place, we are apt to forget those vagaries of the mind which, nevertheless, are capable of imparting to us many a useful lesson; and, secondly, because it will more deeply impress us with the fact, that, notwithstanding the novelty of some of the current notions of the day, their types may be found amid the discarded follies of former generations.

During the period which witnessed the revival of the human mind in Europe, it not unfrequently happened, in one place or another, that the ordinary course of men's habitudes and thoughts was varied by the intrusion of some singular combination of notions and practices which confounded the wisdom of the learned, enchained, as by a spell, the imagination of the ignorant, stimulated the darkest passions of the heart, and generally left behind a fearful experience of bloodshed and woe. During the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, epidemics of this kind were among the most common events, and their victims were scarcely outnumbered by those of war, pestilence, and famine. In France, in the single reign of Francis the First, it was estimated by a writer of the time, that a hundred thousand persons were executed for witchcraft, and the number still continued to be very large through the remainder of the sixteenth century. The neighboring countries were scarcely less afflicted, and the civil power was often aided by the more ardent efforts of the ecclesiastical, in checking the growing evil. Pope Adrian the Sixth, scandalized by the prevalence of sorcery in Lombardy, set the Dominicans upon the work of its extermination, and such was their zeal and energy in the congenial employment, that, for some dozen or fifteen years, they sent to the gibbet about a thousand persons annually, in the district of Como alone. In Spain, witches shared with heretics and Jews in the tender mercies of the Holy Office. Thirty women were burned in Calahorra in 1507. A few years later the prisons of Navarre were filled with women charged with sorcery, and at Estella one hundred and fifty received each two hundred stripes on their bare shoulders. At the same time

many were destroyed by the Inquisition, in Saragossa. Savoy was regarded as a great hot-bed of sorcery, and in the town of Valery alone, within a single year, eighty persons were consigned to the flames. In Switzerland, whole villages are said to have been depopulated. In Languedoc, four hundred were sent to the stake in the year 1577, nearly all of whom, says a distinguished professor of law, Gregoire of Toulouse, bore the mark of the Devil. In Lorraine, towards the end of the sixteenth century, nine hundred were put to death within a short period. During the next two centuries this particular form of the frenzy appears to have been less common, or, what is more likely, was less noticed, but the multitudes that swelled the ranks of the *Trembleurs* of Cevennes and the *Convulsionnaires* of St. Medard show that the evil had only changed its form. Its traces may be seen in many of the religious movements of a later day, and we are not quite sure that the world has seen the last of it, even in its most striking forms. Dr. Smith's paper makes us acquainted with one of these epidemics which broke out in 1841, in the province of Iönköping in Sweden, and soon numbered its victims by thousands.

Religion, instead of coming to the aid of man in these terrific emergencies with the light of a pure and rational faith, became his most implacable foe, and mental philosophy could find nothing, either in the speculations of Plato or the refinements of the schoolmen, that would furnish a solution of the fearful enigma. The saddest fact in these extraordinary movements is the ready ministry ever offered by the wise and learned of the time in fostering the superstition of the rude and vulgar masses. During the long period which witnessed these moral commotions, not a single commanding voice was heard to rebuke the spirit of credulity and cruelty which universally prevailed. Learned judges like Sir Matthew Hale, physicians as shrewd as Ambrose Paré, monarchs, popes, and theologians of every description, lent the sanction of their authority to the prevalent belief in witchcraft. Such anomalous departures from the ordinary forms of opinion and rules of conduct can never lose their interest with reflecting minds, and therefore we venture to extract a page or two from this dark chapter in the history of society.

Previous to the eighteenth century, an almost invariable feature of the moral epidemics in question was the idea of diabolical agency. It was perfectly consonant with the religious opinions of those times, that the Devil had a hand in whatever mischief was enacted, but the evidence of the senses also was never wanting. The eye, the ear, the touch, was cognizant of his presence, and in an age when rules of evidence were unknown, the testimony of one person was as good as another's. We now talk, indeed, of witchcraft as a melancholy delusion, but before it can yield its appropriate lessons as part of the moral history of the race, we must have more philosophical ideas than have usually prevailed respecting its curious phenomena;—the reappearance of certain notions and practices, at distant intervals and among remote people; that enthrallment of the senses that changed the creations of the imagination into stern realities; that reckless, joyful relinquishment of divine aid and human sympathy; and especially, the wild-fire rapidity with which the delusion spread from one to another, until whole districts submitted to its sway. The time has not yet come, perhaps, for explaining all the laws that governed this and other similar epidemics, but the progress of scientific and religious knowledge has given us some advantage in this respect over those who personally witnessed its effects.

It would be difficult to find the period since the Christian era, when men have not believed that the Devil is permitted to hold direct communication with certain individuals, for the purpose of converting them into instruments of his will and pleasure. There is a remarkable uniformity in the narratives of these persons respecting their intercourse with demoniac spirits, and the nature of the malign influences they were enabled to exert. In one way or another they were induced to attend the *Sabbath*; as it was called, or nocturnal assembly of witches and evil spirits, at which they took the oath of allegiance to the Devil, and were initiated into the various means and appliances for honoring their master and working evil to men. To this meeting, held in some obscure place, they rode through the air, on a buck, or a horse, or even a broomstick, their visible form or effigies being left behind. The presiding spirit of these assem-

blages was the Archenemy himself, who was generally represented as having the form of a large buck with the visage of a man, having three or four horns on his head, a long tail, huge claws on his feet, and a very ugly face. The first exercise of the *Sabbath* was to ascertain if all the company had the true Devil's mark, which was some discoloration of the skin, or mole, or wart, that a morbid imagination transformed into figures of a hare, toad, bat, or owl. They then sang, and paid their obeisance to the Devil; the children were baptized into the infernal faith; feasting began, and all manner of abominable orgies succeeded. Here, too, charms and incantations were prepared for working evil, mutual encouragement and instruction were given, and finally a cock crowed, and the assembly dispersed. These were the principal incidents of the *Sabbath*, and generally appeared in descriptions of this horrible meeting.

The purposes for which the demoniac influence was exerted embraced almost every form of mischief, physical and moral. It blasted the crops, poisoned the cattle, and scattered the seeds of disease in the house and barn. It raised storms and tempests, engulfed the reeling ship, and brought to naught the labors of man. Especially was it used to produce a state of bodily and mental torment in its victims, — racking pains, ulcers, convulsions, disquiet, blasphemy, and despair. Sometimes the injuries inflicted by its possessors were more definite and tangible. They disinterred the bodies of infants, and feasted upon their flesh, or converted it by a series of concoctions into a powerful unguent. In some cases they assumed the form of a wolf, or other wild beast, and in that guise attacked and devoured children. In others, they were contented to devote themselves entirely to the worship of the Devil.

The effects of the demoniac possession, as that state was called, in which a person was under the special and immediate influence of evil spirits or witches, assumed the form of every variety of suffering. The possessed were precipitated into wells and pits; thrown upon the ground, and, by force of violent convulsions, rolled into a ball, bent into a bow, or raised up in the air without any visible means. Their bodies were covered with bruises and other marks of injury, and racked with every

form of local pain. Superhuman efforts of strength were common, and the toughest cords were snapped asunder in their hands, and strong men were thrown down by the struggles of a delicate woman. Their discourse was filled with blasphemy and obscenity, and accusations against certain persons as the authors of their torments. The approach of those persons was invariably indicated by an aggravation of these torments, and by fresh paroxysms of agitation. Despair of the future and horrible suggestions crowded upon their minds, and, in connection with fasts and vigils, so consumed the energies and peace of the wretched sufferers, as to render death a desirable relief.

Almost every one of these epidemics, however, was distinguished by some feature peculiar to itself. In one, the possessed were constrained to climb the trees, and perambulate upon the house-tops. In another, they felt impelled to bark and howl like dogs; and in another, to mew like cats.

The possessed usually indicated the persons whom they regarded, upon the testimony of their own senses, as the authors of their sufferings. Generally, the accused, sooner or later, admitted the charge to the fullest extent, and described his communications with Satan with an air of satisfaction and delight, no expression of regret escaping from his lips, even at the gallows. It is remarkable, indeed, how seldom the proof derived from confession was wanting. Even they who most strongly protested their innocence at first, and were, unquestionably, the victims of private hostility, finally acknowledged their crime, and gloated over its disgusting details. In New England alone did they who were executed to the last refuse to confess, and such was the constancy of nineteen out of the twenty who suffered death.

Unquestionably, among the most efficient elements in the production of these affections were often popular error, credulity, and imposture, but neither any one, nor all of them together, will explain satisfactorily all their phenomena. M. Calmeil sees in them all the presence of insanity in some of its forms, and very happily supports his theory, by showing their analogy to other affections unquestionably mental. In some of them, at least, one cannot fail to recognize insanity in the narrow-

est acceptance of the term. A person who believes that, by the use of a certain ointment, he has transformed himself into a wolf, and thus preyed upon children, is obviously insane; and however strange it may seem now, we have only to consider the peculiar circumstances of any particular instance, in order to understand why the disease should have assumed precisely this form. At the commencement of the seventeenth century, *lycanthropy*, as this affection is called, prevailed in the district of Saint Claude in the Jura Mountains, the seat of an abbey since the fifth century. The people of this region, whose wretched condition excited the sympathies of Voltaire at a subsequent period, had always been, both in person and property, the serfs of the monks who bowed them to the earth with their burdens. Physically, morally, and intellectually, their condition was the lowest point of degradation. Subsisting on a meagre, insufficient diet, secluded from all intercourse with the people of other districts, and possessing no ideas not immediately connected with their pursuits but such as were tinctured with the grossest superstition, they presented many cases of idiocy and imbecility, and but few that were many removes from the one or the other. It certainly is not surprising that insanity was a common disease among such people; nor, when an individual became insane, is it surprising that the mind, in its wanderings, ran upon those ideas which had most strongly impressed it while sane. They shared with the learned a belief in the power of Satan over mortals, while they listened with a kind of credulity exclusively their own to tales of diablerie and witchcraft, which divided the attention of their leisure moments with the rites and practices of religion. It was very natural, therefore, that, when the brain was excited to a morbid degree of activity, the predominant ideas should have been of this character, for they could not very well have been any thing else. Insanity made it an easy step from a belief in the possibility of lycanthropy to the conviction that one is himself transformed into a wolf. It was but converting the subjective into the objective, — a phenomenon that is seldom entirely absent in mental disease. The whole story of these persons — of their taking the form of beasts, of going on all fours, and seizing and preying

upon children — is a tissue of delusions, and it was but an additional delusion to believe, as many of them did, that they had interviews with the Devil in the shape of a buck, who provided them with means for exerting their brutal power. We have alluded particularly to this form of mental disease, merely because it furnishes, we apprehend, an apt illustration of the origin and character of much of the insanity of those times. In the phenomena of some other forms of demonomania, the presence of insanity is no less obvious. It cannot be doubted, that, by thousands and hundreds of thousands, it was believed that they had actually engaged in the mysteries of the witch *Sabbath*. This belief they avowed to the very last, and neither the stake nor the gibbet could induce them to deny it. This, of course, is unequivocal insanity.

Possession, too, exhibits many symptoms of insanity, which, misunderstood as they once were, are quite intelligible to the modern observer. After making all reasonable allowance for deception and imposture, as well as for certain abnormal conditions of the nervous system to be more particularly noticed hereafter, insanity, in the ordinary sense, gave rise to many of its phenomena. Under the circumstances of the time, the idea that any one could be completely subjected to the control of a superior spirit constantly prompting him to evil, might be merely an error of opinion; but to see this spirit clothed in the attributes of form and color, to hear his voice actually sounding aloud, to feel the touch of his fingers, and shudder with convulsive agitations at his approach, — what is this but hallucination or delusion of the baldest kind? The witches of Burbie in Germany, towards the end of the fifteenth century, who confessed that at their nocturnal assemblies they destroyed an infant and feasted on its flesh, and who sealed this confession with their blood, believed in a fact which was not pretended to be proved, easy as it was of proof. The pretended *anthropophagi*, or man-eaters, in the district of Vaud, towards the beginning of the fifteenth century, who filled the country with terror, and perished at the stake by scores, lived and died in the belief, which could be no other than the offspring of insanity, that they rendered formal homage to Satan, and implored his assist-

ance and protection; that, in the practice of their rites, they made an unguent by boiling down a new-born infant; and that by the use of this unguent they could move from place to place by invisible means. Were we writing a medical treatise, we should extend our illustrations of this point, but this will be sufficient for our present purpose.

Earnest as M. Calmeil is to establish his theory, that these epidemics are a form of insanity, he does not anticipate the objections that, with some plausibility, might be offered against it. We shall endeavor to supply this deficiency in some measure, because the discussion will furnish additional confirmation of the correctness of the theory. The laws of nature, it is said, do not change; phrenitis, pneumonia, gastritis, &c., present the same characteristics now, that they did to Hippocrates; consequently, since diseases do not change their character with time, and we see no *such* insanity now, we are forced to conclude that the phenomena in question had not a physical and pathological origin. The general principle here expressed is undoubtedly true, but an important fact is overlooked. Although insanity is a disease, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, a morbid affection of the cerebral organism, yet its mental manifestations must vary, not only with the mental circumstances of the individual, but also with the prevailing currents of opinion and feeling in society, and the character of the moral and intellectual culture of the times. Were it possible to have before us the "Case-books" of an insane hospital for the last four centuries, we should be able to trace, as strongly marked as on the page of history, those great social movements which, for good or for ill, have agitated the race. Insanity is not another name for confusion and chaos. It presents the night-side of the mind, so to speak, yet to the practised observer it reflects, with more or less clearness, the moral and social peculiarities of the country and the times. For instance, during the French Revolution and under the Empire, the police of France was made an engine of despotism more efficient than the world ever witnessed before. No one was too high or too humble to be beyond its reach, and the stoutest heart might quail before the thought of its all-pervading, invisible, resistless power. Accordingly, during this

period, a large proportion of the inmates of the lunatic hospitals of Paris exhibited their alienation in excessive and groundless fears of the police, but scarcely an instance of religious delusion could be found in those vast establishments, for alas! religion had disappeared from France. In this country, on the other hand, where religious exhortations furnish the principal, if not the only, pabulum of thought to a very large proportion of minds, a conviction of spiritual ruin, connected, perhaps, with the idea of having sinned away the day of grace, or committed the unpardonable offence, is now, and always has been, a common trait of insanity. In like manner, Millerism, Mesmerism, Antimasonry, gold-hunting, Abolitionism, have each left, in the records of our lunatic hospitals, enduring memorials.

Bearing these facts in mind, we shall have no difficulty in accounting for the former prevalence of demoniacal insanity, and its disappearance at the present time. The doctrine of Satanic agency in the affairs of men, though far from being regarded now, even by the learned, as an exploded error, is not very heartily embraced by any, and excites but little practical interest. In the more intelligent parts of Christendom, people have ceased to be frightened by those terrific images of the Devil, which were once thought necessary to deter the children of men from wandering in the paths of sin. Hence it happens, that, in our establishments for the insane, nothing is more rare than a patient whose predominant ideas are of a demoniacal character. In the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, the doctrine in question was a matter of active, thorough, and unhesitating belief. By the Church it was regarded as one of its strongest pillars, and the people found in it abundant materials for gratifying that love of the strange and the marvellous which always accompanies a deficient mental culture. Indeed, there was little else beyond the narrow circle of their daily avocations to kindle the fancy, or excite any activity of thought. In insulated districts especially, communities had but little intercourse or interchange of thoughts with one another; the simplest elements of knowledge were beyond their reach, and their only intellectual exercise was to listen to the exhortations of the priests, which were filled with appeals to the

lower sentiments of our nature. The fear of the Devil was one of them, and for ages it was a potent instrument for accomplishing their ends. He was represented as virtually sharing with God the direction of sublunary affairs, even to the hearts and souls of God's intelligent offspring; ever on the watch to take advantage of the slightest infirmity, as well as the gravest sin, in order to effect the ruin of the weak and erring mortal. In solitary paths, secluded woods, and deserted habitations, their fears conjured up his image in bodily shape, and what the visual organ failed to perceive was clearly visible to the keener conceptions of the inward senses. At the domestic fireside and in the social reunion, the manœuvres of the Devil and his associates were a prominent topic of discourse, which sunk into the minds of the young, seldom to be eradicated by the judgments of riper years. In the church and in the graveyard, in the field and the forest, in the house and the barn, the symbols of his power or presence met them at every turn, and called up a train of associations, grave or gay, horrible or ludicrous. In the dim twilight, in the silent night-watches, in the dreams of the fevered brain, did the mysterious presence assume, with remarkable distinctness, the form and lineaments of some earthly type. Under such tuition, through a course of many generations, the mind was prepared for those exhibitions of insanity, which to us, under a very different training, are so strange and unintelligible.

The proofs of insanity are no less striking in those extraordinary manifestations of the religious sentiment unconnected with demoniacal notions, which prevailed epidemically in Europe, especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The predominant ideas were very different, certainly, from those we have been describing, in being far less foreign and repulsive to our better nature, but their pathological origin is too manifest to be easily overlooked. The peculiarities of the times sufficiently account for the change of type, to use a medical phrase, which the affection assumed. The religious reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries not only turned the attention of men into new channels of inquiry, but greatly enlarged their field of vision, and filled it with objects and aspects never contemplated be-

fore. The rule of the Church, for long ages as inflexible as the laws of nature, gave way, in some measure, to the rule of private judgment. The right thus suddenly acquired was exercised with none of that philosophical caution which, in a more enlightened age, guides the speculations of the least philosophical minds. Men rushed to its enjoyment with a reckless ardor, that disregarded the rules of logic, as well as the suggestions of a rational faith. The Bible, which had been a sealed book, was opened to all, but its contents were imbibed without any principle of discrimination, and consequently the aliment thus offered to the religious affections was not of the healthiest kind. People were not in the humor to trouble themselves with principles of exegesis, or to consider very closely the relative adaptedness of different portions of the Bible to the varying conditions of mankind. The Scriptures were searched, not for a rule of conduct for the steady improvement of the heart and life, but for new and extraordinary views of duty, and summary methods of vindicating the ways of God to man. They were prized, not as a source of consolation to the weary and broken spirit, but as an armory furnished with weapons of spiritual warfare. To the people of those days, the Sermon on the Mount had less attractions than the abstrusities of St. Paul. Hence, there arose a host of contending sects, with their usual train of doctrines and controversies. The themes on which they delighted to meditate and dispute were not unworthy of angels, it is true, but to the limited capacities of man, they could only foster that religious zeal which is the prolific parent of fanaticism. Between fanaticism and monomania the step is easy, and when taken, the mind wandered, not on the Devil and the torments he inflicted, but on the mysteries of revelation that had been hid from ages, on the divine gifts promised to the saints, on foreknowledge of the future, and special revelations vouchsafed from on high. Muncer, the Anabaptist, believed that God revealed to him his will, and commanded him to purge the Church. Hutter, another of the sect, boasted of holding personal communication with God, and always began his exhortations with a "Hear the word of the Lord; behold what the Eternal declares." A young girl cried aloud in the streets of Appenzel, "I am the Christ, the

true Messiah, the desired of nations." Of a similar character were the extravagances of the French *camisards*, who, when filled, as they imagined, with the Divine afflatus, saw the heavens opened, and hosts of angels standing before the throne of God, and heard their songs of praise and glory.

Demoniacal possession, however, did not at this period cease to characterize religious epidemics, for the doctrine of Satanic agency had not ceased to be an active element in the popular belief. It certainly had become less frequent, because in Protestant communities its dominion over the mind was shared by worthier sentiments, and its legitimate influence was counteracted by a higher culture and a purer faith. But the time had not arrived when such a notion could be held merely as a passive speculation. Occasions would happen, when, favored by the temper of the individual, the zeal of sect, or the peculiarities of the times, it would not be held in check, but assumed an ascendancy over every other article of faith, degrading the intelligent and aspiring Puritan of New England to the same level with the benighted and besotted Catholic peasant of Europe. Regarded as a matter of fact that admitted of no question, it nerved the arm of the religious reformers of the last two or three centuries, who felt that in their conflicts with sin and worldly allurements they had to deal with unearthly foes, whose existence was no less real to them than it had been to the believers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. To Luther, the idea that the Devil was fighting against him in the ranks of his adversaries was not a speculation, a conjecture; he saw him with the bodily eye, and drove him from his presence with carnal weapons. With a conviction stronger than any sense could supply, Wesley believed that, even in his most sacred ministries, the Devil was ever at his side, to perplex, to annoy, and confound him. Seward, the companion of Whitefield, says, "Satan is generally so busy with me in prayer, that my time is chiefly spent in keeping him off, so that I am often three hours about those intercessions which might otherwise be offered in one sixth of that space."* To the keen intellect of Jonathan Edwards,

* Journal of a Voyage from Savannah to Philadelphia.

the main difficulty in the conversion of sinners appeared to be the special and persevering agency of the Devil. On the occasion of one of those awakenings in which he was personally concerned, he declares, that "Satan raged dreadfully at Northampton."

It might seem, at first sight, as if the epidemical character of these disorders disproved our theory of their pathological origin, for the reason that no form of insanity is observed to prevail epidemically now. This fact, if strictly true, would scarcely weaken the proofs we possess, that it has so prevailed, and that too without our supposing any change in the laws of disease. Of course, nobody imagines that insanity under any form can be propagated, like ordinary epidemic diseases, either by some peculiar condition of the soil or atmosphere, or by emanations from those who are laboring under the disease. If propagated epidemically, it must have been by means of a power very different from these, — special in its character and clearly adequate to produce this remarkable result. This is no crotchet of ours. The existence of such a power has always been recognized, although its nature has never been very clearly understood, and its effects have been but imperfectly appreciated. The fathers of the healing art were satisfied with calling it *sympathy*, and the moderns have accepted the name, without attaching to it a more precise or comprehensive signification. It remains to be seen whether the present state of our knowledge respecting the origin and progress of disease, and especially of affections of the nervous system, will not enable us, if we please to use it, to form more precise notions in regard to the limits of its operation, and the particular conditions under which it is exercised. To show its agency in these disorders, the proper course would be, by proceeding from the known to the unknown, to trace the analogies that connect the obscure and doubtful with the clear and settled. It is easy enough to point out cases with which it has no connection, as well as others in which its presence may be witnessed by the dullest observer. No one would think of looking for it in a tertian fever or an abscess of the liver, and no one would overlook it sometimes in the spread of hysteria and its cognate affections. Indeed, the proposition broadly stated, that ner-

vous disorders are sometimes propagated by sympathy, or imitation, meets with universal assent. The difficulty is in regard to its application to particular cases, in consequence of our imperfect knowledge of the functions of the nervous system, and especially of prejudices in favor of preconceived opinions and fancies. As just intimated, correct views on this subject can be obtained only by collating a considerable number of instances illustrating different phases of the phenomena in question, and thus demonstrating to every candid mind the bond of affinity that unites them together. We have no intention of pursuing the inquiry here. Our limits forbid us to do more than adduce a few facts, not so much to establish any particular point, as to indicate the course which such an inquiry should take.

The simplest, but not the least remarkable, form of the power or law in question is that which affects single individuals, breaking down all the barriers erected by purity of character, intellectual attainments, and a disciplined judgment. The liability of the priests who were engaged in exorcising the possessed to become affected themselves, was well recognized in France, and they entered upon their professional duty with a strong conviction of their danger. In the early part of the seventeenth century, a convent of Ursuline nuns at Loudon became the scene of demoniacal possession on a large scale. As most of them belonged to noble families, and were highly cultivated and accomplished, they received the unstinted attentions of the clergy, many of whom were sent by the ecclesiastical authorities to render all possible aid, and endeavor, by means of all the weapons of spiritual warfare, to expel the demons from the persons and precincts of the afflicted sisterhood. Three of these exorcising priests, Fathers Lactantius, Surin, and Tranquil, became possessed by the very demons they tried to cast out, the first and the last dying raving maniacs, while the other, after several paroxysms, finally recovered. The fiends, which left Father Tranquil in his last moments, passed directly into Father Lucas, who was at the bedside of the dying priest. Among those who were accused by these nuns of contributing to their sufferings by demoniacal means was Urban Grandier, a priest in the village of Loudon, distinguished

by his mental accomplishments, by the grace of his manners and the comeliness of his person, and by some passages of gallantry, somewhat at variance with modern ideas of priestly propriety. For several months their accusations were scarcely heeded, but they were artfully directed from the first by those who had good reason to hate him; and when ready to fail, they contrived to secure the all-powerful aid of Cardinal Richelieu, of whom Grandier had made a mortal enemy by means of some satirical verses. Ecclesiastical suspicion was finally aroused, and judicial proceedings were ordered, but at a time when courts were creatures of the Church or state, the result could be easily foreseen. Neither his sacred office, nor his prominent position in society, nor all the graces of his mind or person, could save him from the stake; and we almost forget his vices in view of the propriety and steadiness which he displayed through every scene of his persecution, the calm but resolute assertion of his innocence, and especially of the heroic — we had almost said Christian — firmness with which he encountered the final torture. The sequel of this remarkable history strongly illustrates the pathological law we are considering. Father Lactantius above mentioned, who took an active part in the prosecution of Grandier, died thirty days after his victim. Mannouri, the surgeon, who testified that he found the Devil's marks on the body of Grandier, saw the ghost of the defunct priest constantly near him, until at last the perception became so vivid, that on one occasion he dropped to the ground in the excess of his terror, and died shortly after with the dreadful image before him. Chauvet, a civil officer who bore some part in the trial, but was no believer in Grandier's guilt, was accused by one of the possessed, and in consequence fell into a state of intense melancholy, from which he never recovered.

In cases like these, we may have no difficulty in perceiving the successive steps which led to the final result. The priestly adversaries of the Enemy entered upon the conflict vividly impressed with its difficulties and dangers. The honor of the Church and their own reputation were at stake, and upon them it depended whether the powers of hell were to achieve a signal triumph over man, or be driven back, in shame and confusion, to their

own abodes. One all-absorbing idea occupied their minds, — they found themselves in close communication with the powers of darkness. With the bodily ear they heard the words of cursing and wrath, uttered by the mouths of the miserable sufferers, and could almost feel the hot breath of the demon scorching their own faces. The cries, convulsions, and agitations of the possessed were before them during the most of their waking moments, and left an impression that only became more vivid in the hours of sleep. Under such unusual trials of the physical and mental powers, protracted for months together, there arose a morbid irritability of the brain, which, by successive stages of excitement, finally passed into that pathological condition which is manifested by hallucinations, delusions, and raving mania. Even without these peculiar accessory circumstances, the professional observer not unfrequently sees a similar effect produced by the intimate association of the sane with the insane.

In that form of demoniacal possession in which multitudes of people were simultaneously affected, as well as in many other epidemic monomanias, the operation of the influence in question is not so intelligible, perhaps, as in that just considered. In the latter, we see an imagination glowing with religious fervor, and heated by strange and unusual impressions, and physical powers exhausted by prolonged exercises of watching, fasting, and prayer; and in these conditions we easily perceive sufficient causes for the reception of a disorder with which the individual is in close proximity. In the masses affected by the epidemical form, on the contrary, the reflective powers are too dull and sluggish to be injured by undue exercise, and the imagination is not readily kindled by any subjective excitements. The agency of the principle, however, is no less certain, although it may operate in a little different manner. We shall find that, in both cases, the essential elements are the same, — a new strange and striking idea, with momentous bearings upon the welfare of the individual, a mind unfitted by liberal culture to penetrate beneath the false glosses of superstition and credulity, painful anxiety and apprehension of consequences, loss of sleep and interruption of the usual habits of regimen, with counsel and management more calculated to aggravate the evil than to abate it.

To this view of the subject there is an obvious objection, an answer to which will lead us to the most efficient agent in the production of these epidemics. The propagation of mental delusions from one to another is a phenomenon so analogous to the propagation of opinions in sound men, that we find in it nothing apparently impossible; but the propagation of physical disorders principally and primarily by the medium of mental agencies, is a doctrine not so readily assented to by those who are but little versed in this class of inquiries. The principle of sympathy has a greater share in the production of bodily disorders than is suspected by the world at large, or even by most medical men. The fact of such an agency may be assented to in general terms, and its presence may be recognized in isolated cases, while they fail to see in it the most efficient cause of those physical commotions which characterized some of the epidemics we are considering. An enlightened and unprejudiced inquiry into the nature of those movements can lead to no doubtful conclusions on the subject. Irregular actions of the muscular system, to choose an instance as easily understood as any, are manifested in almost every epidemic having a mental origin. The muscles are but the servants of the will, receiving its messages through the medium of the nervous system. It is not strange, therefore, that abnormal muscular action should often follow an abnormal condition of the will, or, in other words, of the mental faculties. Other pathological conditions may be necessary, and, no doubt, often are present, to produce the most striking manifestations of the effect in question, but are not essential to its simpler forms. In ordinary insanity, there is often a remarkable development of muscular power, but in these epidemics the muscular system is the seat of the most disorderly motions,—contortions, spasms, leaping, and rigidity. When this feature appears in connection with the more obvious forms of hysteria, no one misunderstands its true character, and it hardly required the sagacity of a Boerhaave to arrest the progress of an hysterical epidemic in a school at Haerlem, by threatening to brand with a hot iron the next one who should be attacked. The slightest examination of this feature, as it is presented in connection with various forms of mental epidemics, will show us that it is always

essentially the same thing. In the *possession* of the nuns of Loudon and of Louviers, the muscular contortions were so severe, that the body was often bent backward into a perfect circle, the head touching the heel. In the convulsionaries of St. Medard, this was the principal feature of their affection, and at the tomb of the Abbé de Paris, the Jansenist, was opened a new leaf in the history of nervous affections. For four years the marble that covered the remains of the venerated deacon was supposed to shed abroad a healing influence upon those who laid down upon its surface, when at last a person in this position was suddenly attacked by convulsions; and from that moment, during a period of ten years, nearly every one of the individuals, amounting to some thousands, who touched the marble, was affected in a similar way. The irregular action was manifested by the most wonderful contortions of the neck, shoulders, and limbs, and, in many instances, of limbs that had been paralyzed for years, while the pulsations of the heart were quickened, and loud cries and other expressions of pain indicated the violence of the emotions. Fearful and painful as the affection was, it was courted for the sake of the bodily or spiritual benefit supposed to flow from it, and the cemetery of St. Medard was crowded with pilgrims from all directions, waiting their turn to lie down upon the tomb, and yield themselves to the strange commotion that shook their frame. No one was proof against its influence, which reached every description of persons, — professed devotees, sceptics, idlers, Jesuits; the halt, the lame, the blind, and children of tender years.

The great awakenings produced by the early Methodists were strongly marked by irregular action of the muscular system. An eyewitness of one of them, whose narrative is quoted by Wesley, says: —

“Great numbers wept without any noise; others fell down as dead; some sinking in silence; some with extreme noise and violent agitation. I stood on the pew-seat, as did a young man in the opposite pew, an able-bodied, fresh, healthy countryman: but in a moment, while he seemed to think of nothing less, down he dropped with a violence inconceivable. The adjoining pews seemed to shake with his fall. I heard afterwards the stamping of his feet, ready to break the boards, as he lay in strong con-

vulsions at the bottom of his pew." Another "fell backward to the wall, then forward on his knees, wringing his hands, and roaring like a bull. His face, at first, turned quite red, then almost black. He rose and ran against the wall. . . . The violent struggling of many has broken several pews and benches. Yet it is common for people to remain unaffected there, and afterwards to drop down in their way home. Some have been found lying as dead on the road. . . . Among the children who felt the arrows of the Almighty, I saw a sturdy boy about eight years old, who roared above his fellows, and seemed in his agony to struggle with the strength of a grown man."

The celebrated awakening in Kentucky, in the year 1800, was marked by the same phenomenon :—

"At the Cane Ridge Sacrament," says one account, "not less than one thousand persons fell prostrate to the ground. . . . Immediately before they become totally powerless, they are seized with a general tremor. . . . In some instances their hands and feet become cold, and their pulse and breath, and all the symptoms of life, forsake them for nearly an hour. . . . Persons have fallen on their way home from public worship, and sometimes after their arrival. In some cases they have fallen when pursuing their common business on their farms, or when they had retired for private devotion."

It would be unnecessary to multiply examples. These sufficiently establish the general proposition, that strong mental emotions, whether confined to individuals, or spreading through a multitude, are liable to be accompanied by irregular action of the muscular system. The same may also be shown to be true, in regard to other physical symptoms. Thus is removed what we apprehend to be the main objection to the pathological character of these epidemics, as well as to our theory of the principle of their propagation. A broader view of the subject is necessary, in order to arrive at a proper appreciation of the agency of this principle in directing the course of human affairs. Its influence, under normal circumstances, has been abundantly recognized :—

"As bodily affections seem to be in certain cases contagious," says Dugald Stewart, "where they are altogether unaccompanied by any mental passion or emotion, so, on the other hand, the passions and emotions felt, or supposed to be felt, by one individual, have a tendency to spread among his companions, even without the intervention of any external expression manifested

in the appearance. When the feelings of a crowd are in unison, or conceived to be in unison, from the operation of some common cause, and when at the same time these feelings begin, in a few individuals, to manifest themselves by strong bodily agitations, the effect is likely to be incalculably great; the mind at once acting on the body, and the body reacting on the mind, while the influence of each is manifested by the inexplicable contagion of sympathetic imitation."

The main facts, then, of the existence of this principle of sympathy as an essential attribute of our constitution, and of its agency in propagating nervous affections, may be regarded as established. It is very probable, however, that we are not yet fully acquainted with all the forms or modes of its operation, and it may one day appear that it really-bears a part in many of those phenomena that now puzzle the candid observer. When we see the will of one person apparently controlling the will of another, and the consciousness of one become the consciousness of another, without any visible interchange of thought, we have reason to believe that the agency of this principle might be discovered under an intelligent investigation. It is not to be believed that it causes the secrets of man or nature to be revealed, or adds a single new fact to our knowledge, but we may suppose that, by its help, the predominant thought, the restless desire, may be discerned, even while they remain in the inmost chambers of the soul. When an impassioned speaker is addressing an assemblage of persons deeply interested in his discourse, each one becomes as conscious of certain thoughts and emotions in the mind of his neighbors, as if they were proclaimed in audible tones. This fact is familiar to every body, but it is doubtful whether it differs essentially from many other facts that seem, at first sight, to be of an entirely anomalous character. After making every reasonable allowance for deception and credulity, we are disposed to believe that there is really, under some circumstances, a more intimate communion of mind with mind than the philosophy of our times is willing to admit. The kind of observation proper for establishing this fact is yet to be made,—an observation equally remote from that blind acquiescence which sees just what others wish it to see, and from that unyielding scepticism which refuses to see what it has not seen before.

In its moral, religious, and political bearings, this law of sympathy is one of immense importance. We have seen the tremendous mischief that has frequently resulted from its abuse. If, in times of darkness and superstition, its power has been so fearfully developed for evil, what an amount of good might we not expect from it when managed with intelligence and directed into healthy channels. Its efficiency has always been practically recognized by the leaders of popular movements, especially those of a questionable moral complexion, and the fact will sufficiently explain results that cannot be attributed to argument nor to a stronger love of the right and the true. To despise its aid, therefore, in a good cause, would be only to show that "the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light."

J. R.

ART. VIII. — JANE BOUVERIE.*

It may seem strange that a work so simple and unpretending as this should be selected from among so many competitors for special notice. It has not dashed among us with a mysterious "Jane Eyre" power, to compel instant attention and provoke hot discussion. Our choice of it as a theme of remark has been wholly voluntary. The high-pressure system is carried so completely into all the dealings of man, woman, and child, — alas! — and that which hurries, excites, stirs up from the depths, and takes by storm, has so monopolized the interest of society, that it requires some courage to hope that a quiet whisper about quiet things shall be heard.

And yet the deep current of quiet things, unfathomably deep, is running on for ever beneath the tremendous surface-billows of life; and therein dwell innumerable souls. These souls come from a different realm, pass through this, and vanish into another, having nothing to do with the bustle, the notoriety, the great sayings, writ-

* *Jane Bouverie; or Prosperity and Adversity.* By CATHERINE SINCLAIR, Author of "Sir Edward Graham," "Holiday House," "Modern Society," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. 12mo. pp. 334.

ings, and doings of the world through which they make their obscure transit; and yet these have an existence as whole, and are as complete souls, as any that have ever worn the robe of flesh. There may be much power and beauty in them, to be found only by those who seek, or there may be little; but at all events their characters are as much characters in the eye of Him who sent them, their destiny is as mysterious and important, as those of the gowned philosopher, the trumpeted warrior, or the diamond-crowned queen.

We think that those have gained much, who have learned to look into still waters and humble nooks in their search after good. We would gladly direct the young to find social enjoyment in domestic life, literary satisfaction in works that do not violently excite, joys of the heart in affection rather than in passion, and religion in steady disinterestedness and spiritual growth, which is always silent.

Works of genius are sure of comment enough. Abundance of readers, with and without genius, will be sure to find them out, and get either good or evil from them. But many a noble, beautiful, practical sentiment finds its way quietly into the world, and quietly dies out, like a spark dropped among the dewy grass. A modest popularity, perhaps, "two thousand copies sold in a year," with "a call for a second edition," of which our meek author speaks with apparent satisfaction, may have been more than the allotted modicum of renown for many a book, which would do good to thousands if it did but come in their way and secure their attention. A true-hearted author, could he but be sure that he had written that which would make his readers better, might well cry, "Give me circulation rather than admiration! those who will peruse earnestly, rather than those who will praise loudly." Would that the circulation did not depend so much on the admiration!

Not loudly, but sincerely, would we praise "Jane Bouverie," and recommend it especially to that now immense portion of the reading public, woman. What were the literary tastes and occupations of Matilda, the pattern wife of that bad man, William the Conqueror, or whether she could read at all, we are not prepared to say; her needle-exploits on the Bayeux tapestry being better remembered

by us. But in these days, the most inveterate worker in Berlin wools who undertakes to furnish her own boudoir still finds time to scan more books, including periodicals, than all the monks in England could have transcribed in one year of Matilda's reign. What she reads, and for what purpose, are serious questions.

"Jane Bouverie" has "little story and less plot," to speak in the style of reviewers who flourished when reviewers were critics. It had one decided attraction for us in the outset; for it purports to be the autobiography of an old maid. The heroine actually lives through a long life, and dies unmarried. The author has ventured to take one step towards the course we have long desired to see carried through, the direct and successful introduction into literature of fictions, in which love and marriage shall not constitute the chief interest. "Jane Bouverie" is the youngest of a family, consisting of several sons and daughters. Her parents occupy one of the most undesirable positions in society, being the poor relations of wealthy and aristocratic personages. But having very rational ideas of the true sources of happiness, they do not belong to the tribe of "poor relations" so admirably described by a modern satirist. They maintain their independence by shunning the jewelled circles and pompous boards where they could only be admitted by condescending courtesy, and they bring up their children in simplicity and peace. Unfortunately, a proud, self-willed, opulent grandfather is struck with the marvellous loveliness of Jane's two elder sisters; her father becomes embarrassed in his circumstances, and is compelled to yield to the gracious intentions of the old man, who summons the family to forsake their charming country home for London, and sends the two beauties to Paris for their education; a fate which our heroine narrowly escapes, through the entreaties of her judicious mother. The nobleman, however, disposes of his grandsons also to his satisfaction, and Jane alone remains at home with her parents. Her brothers and sisters have not enough of good sense and Christian principle to withstand the worldly influences among which they are thrown. The eldest daughter marries solely for money, and becomes utterly selfish and heartless. The second does rather better, but is estranged from the attractions of the pa-

rental home. The brothers, too, are whirling along in the great world. The mother dies, and Jane devotes herself to the care of her solitary father. Her devotion is not quite so exclusive, her abstinence from the frivolities of the gay world not so entire, as would have seemed a genuine, thoroughly Christian heroine in similar circumstances. Still it is a beautiful and natural picture of filial piety and self-sacrifice; and we believe that in the by-paths of life many an original might be found for it.

But a heroine without lovers! that would never do. Jane Bouverie, like the Evelinas and Belindas of the old school, must reject several, must prefer one, must fall actually in love, must suffer terribly in consequence of a crossed attachment, and the reader must be edified with a few lover's speeches, which each girl of fifteen will peruse with more curiosity than any thing else in the book, wondering if the like will ever be addressed to her. We suppose it was necessary that in some form these adventures should be introduced, to set our heroine's principles, strength of character, and spirit of self-sacrifice in the strongest light; — and necessary, also, in order that another intimation might be conveyed. Our author's pride of sex, like that of every true woman, undoubtedly has been often roused by the common supposition, that, if a woman lives single, it is because no man has ever asked her to wear the orange-blossom for him. She has sympathy with the three venerable sisters who used to declare, "*We* might have married, for our Susan had an offer." It is to be understood that every spinster has had a chance to marry at some time or other. And so Jane Bouverie refuses very eligible opportunities, and lives on with her good old father till he dies, as much of an Antigone as modern life and London society will permit.

After his death, her state of mind and occupations are beautifully described; and yet we fear the impression left on the mind of the young female reader will be rather a sad one. We think the loneliness need not have been thrown so much into the foreground of the picture. Its shadows might have been relieved by brighter gleams of religious cheerfulness and active usefulness, which would have added much to the wholesome influence of

the book. We need antidotes everywhere to the dangerous, all-prevailing idea, creeping insidiously into young hearts, that *woman must marry*, or not fulfil her destiny, not claim that place in God's creation and man's respect which her nature deserves and craves, not be as happy here as earthly imperfection will admit.

A dangerous idea we call it emphatically, for out of it, we are satisfied, spring hasty, half-reluctant, ill-assorted marriages, unhappy celibacies, and even sins and sorrows of deeper dye. Many an inexperienced young creature thinks she is innocently on the way to that mysterious, holy, happy land of matrimony, which she hears so glowingly described, all of whose inhabitants seem to stand on a somewhat more exalted ground than their sisters, — and under this delusion she falls. Let the courts of justice testify to this, with the stress they justly lay on that item of evidence, “under promise of marriage.”

There is a point touched upon in the twenty-second page, which has a good deal of practical bearing in our own community. Jane beguiles her solitude and redeems her time by active beneficence, until she finds herself the victim of so many impositions, that she prudently subscribes to the best charitable societies, and intrusts the rest of her almsgiving to her pastor. This is a generous and wise course. Charitable societies could not exist unless many adopted it to some extent; and as few individuals have so many applications for pecuniary aid as clergymen, whose incomes seldom increase with their increasing expenses, it would seem good that they should sometimes be the almoners of the wealthy. “But,” she adds, “thus benevolence, as a source of occupation, for my time and feelings, was no more.” This is a great evil.

Those whose professional duties or family cares engross all their time, may be excused for doing good only by proxy. But we know that benevolent pursuits do but half their work upon the recipients of the charity; the “twice-blessed quality” of mercy being proverbial even to triteness. He that uses his time and engages his feelings in such work has the best opportunity of growing daily better himself. It may be advisable that those who find themselves inexperienced, credulous, and impulsive, liable to waste money on the artful and to in-

crease the amount of imposition, should connect themselves with the charitable operations of well-regulated societies or individuals. Acting in concert with others promotes humility, disciplines the temper, and detects selfishness. They should put themselves to school, as it were; striving to gain experience and discretion. But they should never relax in personal effort of some kind. They should see and hear the poor; they should give them some of that great commodity, time; they should bestow on them kind words and looks of sympathy; they should seek to understand their position, their capacities, their temptations, as well as their wants. The rich and poor must be "brought together" here, as well as in the grave, and to accomplish this in some degree is especially a privilege of the Jane Bouveries of society.

Our approbation of "Jane Bouverie" is of course not unmingled. But if so large a portion of womankind must and will read novels,—and alas! they will till the Millennium, we fear! — we consider Jane Bouverie nearly unexceptionable. Its literary faults lie on the surface. The conversations are singularly stiff and artificial, sometimes regular forensics. And if it were a genuine autobiography, we should say that the heroine's consciousness of her own excellences neutralized every charm in her character; but then we remember she is only the creature of imagination, and so, at the expense of having all the brief illusion destroyed, we are satisfied. But we should think this result would hardly satisfy the author.

And now we will speak of what is to us the great delight and merit of the book. Unobtrusively, but distinctly, throughout the whole volume, the religious principle is recognized as the only source of all that is right or happy, the only controlling power to be acknowledged by the human heart. There is no declamation, no cant on the subject, any more than there is in the actual life and conversation of a modest, pious woman; but we feel the influence of the presence of such faith, while reading this book, as we do while holding daily intercourse with such an individual. It is quiet, but strong and beautiful. It is purifying and elevating.

The secondary charm of the book is, that it is full of excellent thoughts, scattered through its pages in such a way that the most careless must step upon them, stop

to pick them up, and look at them. They are not mere flowers of rhetoric, or hard gems of metaphysical wisdom; but beautiful moral truths, such as concern every-day life in its connection with the world to come. To common minds they will be suggestive, and that is what common minds need. It is not to the scholar or philosopher that we recommend the work.

We will give a few specimens of such passages:—

“God gives us the sunshine, and man himself causes the shade. If all would live to make the very best they can of such materials as are given for rendering themselves happy, and conscientiously endeavor, at the same time, to make every individual around them equally so,—to feel answerable if any one with whom they are associated for a single hour has been rendered less happy during that hour than he might have been,—how much better would all be fitted for that world where mutual goodwill shall universally reign!”—p. 31.

“After he had himself departed this life, he wished to be remembered and talked of by us all, as an absent but still attached friend, rejoicing in our joys and sorrowing in our sorrow. He truly remarked, that if it be an object with those who live for the public to gain public fame, there is also a domestic fame due to those who have deserved our affectionate remembrance,—not the morbid feeling fit only for a heathen, that shuns the very name of those who are gone, but that Christian remembrance which associates the past with the future, and can speak of the dead.”—p. 95.

“It should be a frequent question of those who gain the affections, even if it be merely the friendship of another, ‘Is he the happier for having loved me?’”—p. 128.

“The world becomes perfectly delirious in its ideas of what any individual can do, ought to do, and, in short, must do, with a million of money. Sir Adam is beset with poor relations, distressed artists, unsuccessful authors, deserving families, public charities, and private schemes. Every man who has a hobby hopes to mount him on it, and thinks himself ill-used if Sir Adam hesitates to undertake the whole expense. Those who are least capable themselves of a generous action give out by far the most generous notions for others. If each person might dictate how his neighbor’s income might be expended, this world would become a scene of universal benevolence: but the meanest minds, comparing their own mere theories with the practical liberality of others, live in the mistaken conviction that with the same income they would do as well or better. The shabbiest

people are the readiest to say, when any generous action is mentioned as done by another, 'That is the least he could do.' — p. 137.

We suppose few have had experience in soliciting subscriptions for benevolent purposes without having had reason to indorse these assertions. It is true, the same experience will corroborate the statement made in the words which follow.

"How seldom do the wealthy give of their abundance in any proportion to what the poor give of their penury! The poor, in distributing money, give what they require for the necessaries of life, and the rich only part with what would be required for mere luxuries. If the rich gave away as much of their means as, on their very smallest of fortunes, the poor do, there would be donations that might fill every mind with astonishment and every newspaper with panegyrics." — p. 221.

But, after all, many who are too noble-minded to envy the affluent do judge them harshly. It is well that those who are destined to the unwelcome compliment of being always requested to *head* subscription-papers do not live at one end of a whispering-gallery, with all who choose to comment on their proceedings swarming and buzzing at the other. The unfortunate Rothschilds would dream of stings rather than honey. A true independence, a clear conscience, satisfied that God, to whom alone account is to be rendered for the employment of the *uncommon means of usefulness* he has granted, — for that is the only aspect which wealth can wear to a Christian, — satisfied that God approves, would be able to bear all this injustice calmly. Sometimes the effect of such knowledge might be salutary. An amiable, pious heart it would not irritate, but would simply rouse to more strict investigation of itself and the deeds which have proceeded from it. "Have I really done all that I should? Could I not have done more? Am I sufficiently warm-hearted and impulsive? Can I not cultivate to advantage this part of my nature? Is not my giving too much a matter of mere duty and principle? Am I not apt to ask myself how much *ought* I to give, rather than how much *may* I give? Am I not too much afraid of dealing with large sums? Cannot I attain, through devout study of Christ, a more glowing piety, and conse-

quently a more fervent benevolence?" Such would be the queries springing up in some well-disciplined mind, on hearing that neighbor So-and-so had said, "O, if that gentleman has only given one hundred dollars, I ought to give only ten. I am sure that would be a fair proportion. I am really surprised at him, with his means. I had intended to give more, and I am sure *he* might, and never miss it."

But where one heart would receive the report of such remarks with quiet humility and self-examination, many really good ones would be wounded, pained, and discouraged; and many more would feel unwisely, wrongly indignant. They would make as little allowance for the point of view from which their fellow-creatures must look, as others do for theirs; their benevolence would be cooled, their feelings soured; they would be lost in that cold, impenetrable, hopeless fog, which springs from nothing more surely than from mutual injustice. Unaccustomed to examine their own motives and seek the highest, they would probably be thrown rudely from the ladder of good deeds on which they had begun to mount into a higher and purer region of influences. For we believe that, if people actually do good to their fellow-mortals, even though they begin with somewhat low and mixed inducements, the probability is that they will rise to a capacity of nobler ones. Christ stretches out his hand to draw those whose faces are but turned towards him, though they are unconscious of his near presence.

For the furtherance of general justice, we almost wish, sometimes, that the sunshine might strike upon the thousand little rills of beneficence trickling secretly from the rich to the poor. We fancy the amount of pecuniary aid tendered privately by many wealthy individuals to their needy fellow-creatures would astound and silence many a caviller, who knows nothing of the poor relations, the distant dependants, the unseen lookers-up to the kind hand that scatters help, as the Pope dispenses his benediction from his lofty balcony upon souls who have nothing in common save their reliance on him. We have seen these refreshing rills winding in all directions from one deep, pure fountain of goodness; and the flowers of gratitude that sprung up along their borders were such humble violets that the world marked them

not, crying continually, "Why have we not a *river* from such a source?" The wreath of those violets will not be woven except by the disembodied, nor worn except in the land where there shall be no sun nor moon; but will they ever fade?

On the fifty-eighth page of the volume in our hands, we find an idea well presented, which is little acted upon in our choice of society:—

"If I sit next a clever man at dinner, his richly endowed mind endows mine, he shares his store with me, and my intellect gains something; but sitting beside a man worth a million of money, there is not the slightest chance that a thousand pounds can find its way from his purse into mine; therefore I measure the value of an acquaintance much more by the depth of his mind than by the depth of his pocket."

We had thought of other quotations, but we trust that Jane Bouverie's acquaintance may become so numerous that she will have ample opportunity to speak for herself. One or two passages we select in a spirit of contradiction, because we cannot often let a sentiment we deem false pass unchallenged in a book we recommend. In the preface, our author quotes with adoption these words from a "great divine," we know not who:—"All outward demonstrations of feeling show, not the greatness of the feeling, but the smallness of the mind." This seems to us too sweeping to be fair. The world is little enough inclined to take temperament into its consideration of such matters; and here lies a root of immense, incessant injustice. We ought not to bring temperament forward triumphantly or apologetically, as sufficient justification of any thing in our *own* conduct and characters,—not even before the tribunal in our own souls, where sophistry ever stands ready pleader,—because temperament is given us as the means of our probation; oftentimes, the very thing through which our peculiar temptations are to come, and against which it is our peculiar duty to struggle unceasingly,—it may be through a long life. But we are bound to consider temperament in judging our fellow-beings, at least so far as to suspend judgment where we are ignorant of the nature and power of this mighty underlying influence in our neighbor's moral and physical constitution. To overlook it is almost as bad as

to forget that the precocious little pickpocket, in the constable's grasp, was taught to steal by his mother, and was never taught any thing better.

That we cannot measure the depth and sincerity of feeling by external manifestation is certain. We see an individual silently enduring an outbreak of sudden, insulting passion from another, yet we cannot guess what unforgiving, unforgetting sense of injury may be smothered in the heart of that silent one, to outlast the brief ebullition of the assailant's temper. But it is a rule which works both ways. In cases of grief, for instance, we have no more right to deem the feeling exaggerated, or to undervalue the intellect, when we witness expression more vehement than our own natures prompt, than to take the opposite position. We like in all cases to adopt rather the spirit of the following passage, viewing charitably those who seem cold, and reserving a similar charity for those who appear extravagant: — "Where sorrow is genuine, the presence of any stranger may almost be said to act as a strait waistcoat, in preventing all external demonstrations." We know of no occasions on which comments are more hasty, ignorant, and unjust than in reference to the behavior of the bereaved. To grieve too deeply or too long, or to wear a more prompt and cheerful resignation than is intelligible to the observer, appears to be equally fair game for flippant censure. Cannot man be left to the God who is visibly dealing with his heart?

Jane Bouverie says, — "Over me Eliza had always of course exercised the tyranny which elder brothers and sisters will maintain over their juniors to the end of time." We read this passage twice before we could believe that such an excellent, sensible writer could have so expressed herself. It must have been in a careless or wayward mood, such as may sometimes beset even a saint; but we should have thought her too much of a saint to let such an expression go its way among sinners. We think we could bring forward an army of loving, grateful junior brothers and sisters, to protest against the sweeping injustice of the passage.

And now we conclude with a single extract more, which we think may suggest to our thoughtful reader a train of profitable meditations, bringing on that form of reverie which does not weaken, but strengthen: —

“ There is an unknown history of our own lives, concealed from us in this world, but which it may be our privilege in another existence to learn, and a very curious revelation it will be ! Shall we then know in what degree we have really been loved by others or disliked ? — why various events which seemed about to take place never did occur ? — what influence we ourselves have had over the destiny of others ? — what unimagined effect has followed on some casual remarks ? — what joy or what sorrow we have unknowingly caused ? — what place we have held in the conversation of those who knew us, and even what good or what evil we have unconsciously done ? ”

And yet may there not be a loftier view of the retrospections, occupations, and interests of the future state than is here presented ? This must be intended but as a surmise of what may only partially and feebly claim the powers of a disembodied spirit, in the world where we do hope and pray that all things may assume their *just relations*.

L. J. H.

ART. IX. — MISS MARTINEAU'S GOSPEL OF ATHEISM.*

WE hardly know whether to regard this book as too weak to be soberly criticized, or as too wicked to be laughed at. It professes to be a sort of *novum organum* for physico-mental science ; and its peculiar merit consists in its extreme simplification of the inductive philosophy. There is no longer need of the prolonged collection and diligent collation of facts ; nor is it at all necessary that the facts contain the logical inferences deduced from them. The reasoning of the book reminds us of an inverted pyramid. The basis of facts is a mere apex, — the conclusions sweep the universe. Were we to deny the existence of the sun and stars, because, when we thrust our heads between two blankets, we could see neither “ bodies celestial ” nor any of the light supposed to emanate from them, we should draw, according to the principles here recognized, no more than a legitimate

* *Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development.* By HENRY GEORGE ATKINSON and HARRIET MARTINEAU. London : John Chapman. 1851. 12mo. pp. xii., 390.

consequence from our premises, — nay, more, we should be authorized in asserting, that it is some modification of the component elements of blanket that through the telescope assumes the delusive aspect of binary stars and nebulæ. The science of these six thousand years goes for nothing. Two deaf people (whom their irreverent readers will be very apt to term dotards) have mesmerized half a dozen crotchety invalids, and neither an immaterial soul, nor a personal Deity, nor a life after death, has left any impression upon their fingers. Therefore the soul is brute matter, God is a figment of certain regions of the brain, and the revelation of immortality an audacious lie. The sense of touch is the sole instrument and text of scientific truth, — touching is believing, — the philosophy which finds no entrance through the fingers' ends to the crass and muddled brain is mere priestcraft and foolcraft.

If the reasoning of this book awakens mirthfulness, its moral aspect saddens us. Here are two persons, of at least some intellectual pretension, (one of whom has in former times been ambitious of a name in Christian literature,) now in a state of intense self-complacency, mutual admiration, and jubilant ecstasy, on discovering that they are — brutes. They are in advance of all the rest of mankind, and they know it; but they exhort each other to bear the consciousness of their superiority meekly and kindly, — to remember that they once thought that they had souls, and not to assume arrogant or supercilious airs towards those who still lie under the same infatuation. But they have reached the sublime conclusion that they differ only in shape and in the conformation of brain from the lower animals. They can hardly find words to express their pity for those who are still dogged by the phantoms of freedom and accountability, so sweet is it to be the conscious puppets of organic laws, and to cast all the responsibility of moral action on the relative proportions of the cerebrum and the cerebellum. Immeasurably blessed do they deem themselves, (and with our view of the conditions of a happy immortality we agree with them,) in the assurance that death will dissolve their personality, and render up as available for Nature's further use a certain quantity of phosphate of lime, fibrine, and adipose matter. The only point on which

they disagree is that of the true construction of the Gospel history. The man supposes Christ to have been the most susceptible and skilful of mesmerizers. The woman would think so, had she not read Strauss; but she very sensibly submits, that it is more convenient and rational to regard the whole story as an accretion of myths with no historical basis, than to embrace in the category of mesmeric phenomena facts which so far transcend their own achievements in this line. But they both think that there may have been something in prophecy; for they have had under their hands old women who could prophesy when asleep.

We do not like to soil our pages with blasphemy, and our extracts shall be very brief; but our readers may reasonably desire to know whether, in defining the religious doctrines of this book, we have drawn our own inferences from language which admits of a different import, or whether the language is too explicit to bear more than one meaning. Let the following brief extracts be taken as specimens of page after page which we might quote. Miss Martineau writes, —

“Pray tell me, too, whether, in your last letter, you do not in speaking of God use merely another term for law? We know nothing beyond law, do we? And when you speak of God as the origin of all things, what is it that you mean? Do we know any thing of origin? — that it is possible? Is it conceivable to you that there was ever Nothing? — and that Something came of it?” — p. 164.

“I quite agree with what you say about the idea of another life. The desire of a future existence is merely a pampered habit of mind, founded upon the instinct of preservation. It is a longing, and those who have it are like drinkers or children. The drunkard looks upon the water-drinker as a lower species of animal, and cannot understand his doing without the desire of drinking. The child fancies its own little enjoyment and promised holiday to be all in all, and the whole world of pleasure.” — p. 185. (From Mr. Atkinson's Letter.)

“What is religion but another feature of romance, with its wonders upon wonders, — its hopes, its terrors, its fictions? Baron Munchausen is a tame affair to it.” — p. 234. (Mr. A.)

“Strange as it may appear, and impossible as it may seem to so many, the Christian religion is in fact, and will soon be, generally, recognized as no better than an old wife's fable.” — p. 239. (Mr. A.)

The following passage from one of Miss Martineau's letters we cite, mainly that we may adjure the clergyman here referred to, if traduced, to repel the charge, — if rightly represented, as an honest man, though no longer a Christian, to take up his station outside of the Church, and to let Christianity find in him an open foe in lieu of a treacherous friend.

“ It would interest you to see a letter I am going to answer from a clergyman far in the interior of the United States, who declares that his people, as well as himself, want only truth, — sure that it can never be hostile to holiness. They are not satisfied of the Christian religion being a revelation attested by miracles, and do not see (being Theists) why its value depends on the establishment of such a claim. The phenomena of Mesmerism, — the healing of diseases, thought-reading, *clairvoyance*, and pre-vision, — have awakened this clergyman, as you might suppose, leaving him with a very different impression of the Scripture miracles from that which he brought from college. If I could admit the narratives of Jesus and his miracles to be historically true, I should adopt your view of the powers by which he wrought them. I am disposed, rather, to regard Strauss's exposition of the case to be the true one, and to admit that the tales are mainly legendary, and a perpetuation of the ideas, and repetition of the narratives, of old Jewish traditions. In that case, however, the explanation answers alike well : for the endowment of Orientals with greater mesmeric power than the Western races would alike be at the bottom of the case. No one who has travelled in the East, aware of the facts of mesmerism, can wonder at any amount of belief and statement of ‘ miracles,’ which there abound on every hand. Whoever and whatever Jesus might be, (of which I think we know little or nothing,) the traditions which settled on his head are easily derivable from the physiological and theological peculiarities of the race, its locality and period of time.” — pp. 221, 222.

Entirely consonant with the effrontery of these extracts is the insinuation that Bacon was covertly an atheist, and has privily sown in his writings the seeds of a harvest of atheistical ideas, which has just begun to ripen.

The dissemination of these Antichristian and atheistical notions is obviously the prime purpose of the work before us. And these notions are audacious generalizations from the alleged facts of phrenology and mesmerism. Now, though we do not give our credence to a tithe of the *facts* cited, we might admit them all,

and our faith in the soul's separate existence in God, in revelation, and immortality would be unshaken; nay, perhaps confirmed and intensified. We have neither time nor space for a discussion of the claims of these, as we believe, pseudo-sciences on our reception; but we would offer a few remarks on their potential bearing upon the religious faith of Christendom.

Phrenology, by the tacit admission of its expositors, has not yet passed from the state of a hypothesis to that of a definite and established science. On Mr. Atkinson's own showing, if it has assumed this latter condition, it has first assumed it through his auspices. He has discovered much vagueness and some error in the statements of previous inquirers, and his chart of the human cranium includes new locations, new nomenclature, and new organs. He admits that the dissecting-knife has not yet succeeded in separating the organs from one another, or in identifying the convolutions of the brain with the partitions between them. Their separate existence is assumed in order to suit a certain theory of mental action; and the physical science, thus existing only by courtesy and sufferance, is now made the law and the measure of all truth and all being. In terming the phrenological theory a gratuitous assumption, we do not forget that the manifestations of mind and character bear a certain general relation to the development of the brain, — a proposition which embraces all that observation has fully verified, and all that even Spurzheim professed to have ascertained from the heads of the living, and which was as little doubted a century ago as now. But this relation may be accounted for consistently with the unity of the brain; for its greater or less volume, its more or less commodious stowage, its strength or slenderness of fibre, the superior nearness or remoteness of its fullest portions with reference to the nerves of sense, — all these circumstances would essentially modify the degree and the kind of mental activity, even if the brain is a homogeneous organ.

But if we grant that the brain is an assemblage of organs, we have not begun to disprove the separate existence of the immaterial soul. The consciousness of unity and of identity is unaccountable as a material phenomenon. The idea of self (of the ME, to borrow the

cant of the day) could no more originate from the nice adjustment and harmonious working of the human machine, than from that of the steam-engine or the cotton-jenny. It is, indeed, alleged with truth, that the lesion, the suffusion, or the induration of the brain impairs the action of the mind. And so does the dulness or the loss of his tools impair the operative skill of the artisan. The theory of the soul's embodiment presupposes its dependence on the bodily organs. Could it act without them, it would no longer be embodied; but would be in the same condition with the Deity, who, as we suppose, lives in material forms, but is in no sense or degree circumscribed by them. The phrenologist is at liberty to regard the brain as the soul's case of instruments, which, on this supposition, could not be injured without the soul's being at that point crippled in its power of apprehension, volition, or manifestation. If there be an immaterial soul, it must necessarily be liable to such physical conditions of activity and self-expression, as are contended for by the phrenologist, and virtually admitted by the common sense of the race. The spiritual theory with regard to mental infirmity or inaction may be well illustrated by these quaint stanzas of Sir John Davies:—

“As a good harper stricken far in years,
 Into whose cunning hands the gout doth fall,
 All his old crotchets in his brain he bears,
 But on his harp plays ill, or not all.

“But if Apollo takes his gout away,
 That he his nimble fingers may apply,
 Apollo's self will envy at his play,
 And all the world applaud his minstrelsy.”

Now in the book before us the thread of argument on this subject is so much attenuated, that we trace it with very great difficulty; but we are confident that, in our exposition of it, we are going to render it more than justice. It is as follows. The relative fulness or depression of the several organs of the brain determines in general the mental and moral character. The excitement of any particular organ, by mesmerism or otherwise, brings into intense action the corresponding mental or moral faculty. The intense or prolonged exercise of any faculty produces a local sensation of pain or weariness.

ness, the seat of which can always be identified with the appropriate organ. Therefore thought, volition, and emotion are nothing more than the action of the brain. They are necessitated by the cerebral organization, or by the external influences to which it is subjected. Human freedom, then, is a contradiction of terms. Intelligent causation, or the exercise of power, falls not within our experience, and forms no part of our consciousness. But attributes, of which we have no conception in ourselves, we cannot conceive of as existing in other beings. Consequently, a personal, intelligent, free First Cause is beyond the range of human conception, therefore impossible, therefore non-existent. We have experience only of the immutable operation of physical laws. Law, therefore, impersonal, irrational, automatic Law, working on from eternity to eternity, is the only God of philosophy. Creation from nothing there cannot have been; for there is no immaterial existence, and matter cannot have created itself, and must needs have existed from a past eternity. The creation of organized existence from crude matter is too small an affair to demand the violent hypothesis of an intelligent Creator. Under Mr. Crosse's recent experiments, animalcules have made their appearance on a moistened surface, exposed for several months to the action of an electric current. Such animalcules were doubtless the remote progenitors of man and all the higher animals. Given, then, chaos and electricity, we have the universe of organized sentient and rational beings.

If our readers have not been put out of breath by the rapidity of this demonstration, they have been made aware, in some degree, of the vast indebtedness of the world to these pioneers in hitherto unexplored realms of truth,—an indebtedness which they are by no means chary of proclaiming. But there is one class of phenomena for which they evidently have not formed an appropriate solution. We refer to those of memory. We need not say that it is intrinsically impossible for the experiences of a lifetime to leave prolonged vibrations or permanent furrows in the brain. The minutest motion or impression left by each of the remembered sensations or reflections would, in a few hours, throw the action of the brain into inextricable confusion, or so indent its

whole surface and substance, that new impressions could be made only by obliterating the old. We can conceive of Priestley's materialism, for in his creed there was an Omnipotent Deity, whose unceasing presence might be memory to man, as we believe it to be instinct to the brutes. But if there is no soul, and if there is not in the hands of the Creator "a book of remembrance," which he suffers man to read, then is memory a function of matter, susceptible of anatomical demonstration with sufficiently delicate instruments. We ask for facts,—for facts cognizable by the senses; and are emboldened in our demand by the abnegation of all other evidence, and, most of all, that of consciousness, in the book under review. Let the phrenologists show us under the most powerful microscope the impress of an imbedded idea, or the difference between a young and an old, an empty and a full brain, or the physical characteristics of the brain which are adapted to continuity of impression or action. Let them detect the lumber-closet in the cranium, where memories lie hidden for years, and return fresh and life-like as when they first passed under the shadow of oblivion. But the point is too obvious for grave reasoning. We know that the brain has nothing in its organization, and exhibits nothing in its dissection, that can account for memory. Were our whole body a brain, and were each deposited reminiscence no larger than the point of a needle, we have seen and read and thought enough that is unforgotten, to fill this brain a dozen times over; and we want nothing more or else than memory to demonstrate the existence of a spirit in man,—of a soul, which, though it may perceive and reason through the agency of the brain, has a treasure incapable of being laid up in "earthen vessels," and which asserts the immateriality of its container in the very fact of its preservation.

As regards mesmerism, we believe as little as we can, yet we cannot deny that its practitioners, in the avatar of charlatany and credulity which has attended their labors, are developing some previously occult laws of the human organism. But the mesmeric state is confessedly exceptional, abnormal. Its subjects are for the most part, we think invariably, diseased. The peculiar phenomena which they exhibit are the result of morbid ac-

tion. Generalizations from them cannot, therefore, be applicable to the race collectively. As well might the tubercles in the ulcerated lungs be made the basis of a theory of respiration, as the contortions and vaticinations of the mesmerized be assumed as exponents of the laws of mind.

But while we would enter this caveat, we do not feel the need of it; for the alleged phenomena of mesmerism, incredible as they are except on the most ample evidence, are impossible unless there be an immaterial soul. We will take first the case of abnormal perception. Persons are said to see through thick bandages, and through quadruple envelopes, — to read books placed on the top of the head or against the spinal column. Now, on the hypothesis of the materialist, the eye is the only organ adapted for the purpose of seeing. There is no opening in the skull or between the vertebræ for the transmission of light. There is no avenue by which external objects can come into contact with the brain. Phrenologists in general recognize no cerebral organ of sight; and Mr. Atkinson's "Mental Eye is an *inner* convolution, central, and immediately behind the intellectual faculties." If there be such an organ, a perforation in the skull would be necessary to open this additional inlet for the forms and colors of the external world. If, in philosophical strictness, it is the eye that sees, perceptions corresponding with those of sight cannot take place through any other medium. But if it is the soul that sees, and the eye is only the loophole in its house of clay through which it ordinarily looks out upon the world, then it is conceivable that the soul may at times exercise this function through other avenues, or without any physical instrumentality. While matter must always retain its properties unless it be subjected to some chemical process of change, while the opaque must remain opaque, and no one organism can discharge the offices of another, the immaterial being, in which certain functions are connate and inherent, may perform these functions, generally and normally through certain physical agencies, yet at times independently of them.

The community of thought, feeling, and volition, which is said to be established between the mesmerizer and the mesmerized, perhaps admits of a material solu-

tion. It might be maintained, that, through the electro-magnetic medium of communication, the vibrations of one brain are transmitted to the other. Yet this solution is inapplicable to the pet marvels of adepts and amateurs in this strange art, — to the mesmerizing of distant subjects, the willing of what the patient shall do after the operator has taken his leave, the transmission of directions through a space measured by miles or leagues, and the like. If these things take place, (we say not that they do,) it is physically impossible that the bodies should be in *rapport*, and the communication must be that of mind with mind.

Clairvoyance and prophecy are proclaimed by our authors as undoubted phenomena of frequent occurrence in the mesmeric and other abnormal conditions. Mr. Atkinson has a friend "blind from birth," who "always sees in her sleep," "frequently in her sleep perceives what is going on in distant places, and also foresees future events." She would be an invaluable contributor to the morning papers, for she often sees in the course of the night events which occur during the next day. She, early one Sunday morning, saw a clergyman, at the distance of two hundred miles from her, fall in a dangerous fit in the pulpit; and the same event was witnessed by the congregation at service-time several hours subsequently. Now we believe none of these things; but the writers of this book maintain the reality and veracity of these alleged modes of perception, with the single exception, that, when their dupes dream of spirits and angels, Christ and heaven, they suppose them deluded; for, we are oracularly told, "*Clairvoyance* does not reach beyond phenomena." But were we constrained by the ample testimony of credible people to believe this story of the blind woman, we should be forced to resort to some spiritual theory for its exposition. It is absurd to pretend, that, though the clergyman was her parish-minister, there could have been a physical connection between his brain and hers, which could remain unbroken through so vast an intervening space, and with the interposition of such a legion of disturbing forces. Equally impossible is it, (we do not say *improbable*,) that that "Mental Eye" of hers could see, not only through the septum of the skull, but through houses, fences, and forests innumerable, and

in a plane of vision unaffected by three or four degrees of the earth's curvature. A still stronger draft (if there can be) is made upon our credulity, when we are bidden to believe that the physical causes which were about to produce catalepsy in the clergyman were the objects of her distinct perception, while he was still unconscious of their existence. If *clairvoyance* ever takes place at such remote distances, it must be in one of two ways. Either a personal and omnipresent Deity brings before the inward vision of the *clairvoyant* the semblance of the distant event, or else the soul is for the time being rendered independent of bodily conditions and material laws, and is vested with an ubiquity which may perhaps be a universal attribute of spiritual existences. As for the foresight of future events, a single well-authenticated instance of prescience, too circumstantial to be explained as a fortuitous coincidence, and too remote to be founded on calculation, would be in our apprehension a fuller demonstration of the being and attributes of God than the whole material universe. The harmonies between prediction and fact cannot be ground out in the unreasoning mill of chance; nor yet, under the dominion of impersonal law, could a future event be perceived without an accurate knowledge of the whole intervening chain of causes. If this blind woman, neither knowing nor suspecting the liability of the clergyman to cataleptic fits, did actually foretell this incident, with a variety of concomitant circumstances, embracing places and people out of the pale of her knowledge, this one incident would suffice to convert us from atheism.

We have expressed our doubt of the most marvellous classes of mesmeric stories, not because with our religious belief they seem impossible, (for with God all things are possible,) but because the mystagogues and reporters in this department have generally been unreliable, either as charlatans by trade or as over-credulous by nature or habit. We doubt these narratives on another ground. We have found it exceedingly difficult to procure vouchers for them. The magnitude of the story commonly increases with the square of the distance. When traced towards its origin, it dwindles into a phenomenon easy to be accounted for, or else it eludes pursuit, retreats as we approach it, as Ithaca did from

Ulysses, and, when at last we think we have reached it, vanishes into thin air. But we are not disposed to deny that there may be sometimes a more than casual coincidence between dreams or imaginings and future events, or that such coincidences may have taken place within purlieus claimed as their own by the mesmeric hierarchy. We believe that the current of thought in our waking and sleeping hours is controlled and modified by the same paternal Providence that governs the physical universe; and there may be reasons in the Divine economy for the occasional creation of detailed and minute coincidences between outward events and mental experiences. In modes like these, the individual soul may sometimes be prepared for impending calamity, or impressed with a more profound sense of Divine realities. Nay, our theology would lead us to anticipate the not infrequent recurrence of these harmonies; and probably the reason why among rational Christians they have fallen into so general discredit is, that they have from time immemorial had superstitious rather than religious associations connected with them, that they have been regarded as external phenomena, not as mental experiences, and have been deemed the work of inferior, often of malignant agents, not the thoughts breathed into the soul with genial purpose and a kindly mission by the spirit of the All-merciful. We are by no means solicitous to establish any theory of direct communication from the spiritual world. We are satisfied with the Bible, and feel no need of supplementary revelations of any sort. But there are in many families and neighborhoods authentic traditions, more or less recent, of experiences like those of which we now speak, and they are of such a nature that it is impossible to account for them on the doctrine of chances. If there are any of our readers who are constrained to give credit to facts of this class, we would show them where to look for their only possible solution, not in phantoms from the under-world, not in the incantations of the living or the night-walking of the dead, but in the spiritual presence and providence of the Universal Father.

What strikes us the most forcibly, as regards alleged mesmeric and similar abnormal phenomena, is the running commentary which they furnish on St. Paul's text, "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."

The manipulators of various name, who have sprung as scions from the mesmeric stock, have few of them been friendly to Christianity. Many of them have been mere money-hunters; and of the residue, the greater part have assumed a hostile position towards the general faith of Christendom. Yet what is the result? If they have wrought any thing, or proved any thing, they have heaped up new and incontrovertible evidence of the being of God and the immateriality of the human soul. Their pretended discoveries would be such perfect demonstrations of these fundamental doctrines of religion, that, were we conscious of a wavering faith in spiritual things, we should be at some pains to convince ourselves of a class of facts which we now hold in suspicion, and for the consideration of which we confess a lurking distaste. Then, too, as regards the miracles of the New Testament, Miss Martineau for once is right in saying that mesmerism does not begin to account for them. Reverence forbids our carrying out the comparison;—it is enough to name the events at Nain, at Bethany, at the sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea, to show how unassailable is the citadel of our Christian faith by any of the pretended marvels and professing wonder-workers of our own age.

We can neither find nor give pleasure by a more extended notice of the book under review. Should it be deemed worthy of republication in this country, we would suggest as a motto for the American edition this pregnant passage of holy writ:—“Because they received not the love of the truth, God shall send them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie.” We forbear to quote the rest of the sentence. In addition to the characteristics of the book which we have indicated, we might have spoken of its egotistical character; for there is hardly a philosopher or discoverer to whom any credit is given, except Bacon, whose frequent obscurity of language renders the gross caricature of his thoughts a comparatively easy matter. “I and Bacon” are the joint writers of almost every letter, Bacon occupying the place of a junior partner. Because the book is egotistical, it is morbid, sickening, disgusting in its details. The writers are, both of them, diseased persons, and morbidly self-conscious and curious as to the diseased action of their own systems. They have raked for the

index-facts of the universe among the maimed, the blind, the epileptic, and the idiotic; and we cannot find that they have ever thought it worth their while to study the phenomena of a healthy body or a sound mind. We are glad that they have produced so nauseous a book. Would to Heaven that impudence, impiety, and blasphemy might never again appear in less loathsome attire!

A. P. P.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The Races of Men: a Fragment. By ROBERT KNOX, M. D. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1850. 12mo. pp. 323.

A FRAGMENT of what, we wonder. The book is arranged — if such a word may be applied to such a production — in thirteen lectures, which have been publicly delivered in England. In what way must remain a mystery; for they vary in length from four to sixty-seven pages each. It is put together as the result of vast observation, profound study, and great acuteness and originality of perception; at least, so the Doctor loudly calls upon us to believe. And how is it, then, a fragment? We have it. Prodigious as the work is, it is but a small part of what he could tell us, if he were not in so much hurry. But this will do. It is quite enough. The simple facts, that his mind is so unmethodized, and his speech so incoherent, — not to say inconsistent, — as often to leave it doubtful what he really means to say; that his temper is too vehement and scornful to reason; and that his abrupt style occasionally rises into the “Orphic,” — may perhaps give him a right to the title of fragmentary, in a still further sense. His main doctrine is, that the several races of men are all originally distinct, and *race is every thing*. The italics are his. He is determined to stick by the whole assertion, without abating a jot. A man is a Catholic because he is a Celt, and a Protestant because he is a Saxon, and there can be no mistake about it. He breaks off, in rather a tantalizing way, when he hints at the marvellous significance of “the nodule of bone growing upon the inner side of the arm-bone.” He does not even develop into any great distinctness the “transcendental theory of anatomy,” which he calls “the greatest discovery ever made, not even excepting the law of gravitation.” For this deficiency the curious and patient reader

may find consolation in the mystifications of Oken, as they are set forth in Felton's Menzel,—a most entertaining book,—or in Mr. Stallo's volume, which is certainly of a very different class. The meaning, however, of such passages as these is tolerably plain, we think:—"The organic and inorganic worlds have coexisted, no doubt, from all eternity. Perhaps they form but one. The discovery of the creation of the world by fixed laws is due mainly to Oken," etc.

Dr. Knox rejoices in his descent, we believe, from John Knox, the famous Scottish Reformer. We doubt whether old John would rejoice much over him. His stern face would grow a little fierce, we imagine, at the sight of his degenerate descendant. Not that he does not sometimes say good things and in a bright way; but his doctrine is a mischief, his prejudices are bitter, his spirit is most unfavorable to the sober search after any truth. A disagreeable cynicism pervades his pages, as well as a wonderful store of affectations and bits of extraordinary English. If we were obliged to sum up our idea of him in a single sentence, we should say that he was a boastful dogmatist, eaten up with German nonsense and his own conceit, uttering in snatches and riddles a theory of materialism and despair. We have been told that he intends paying a visit to these United States. We pray you do, Doctor; provided you will not inflict your lectures upon us, or expect us to receive you with any marked distinction. Perhaps you will see reason, after you have looked at us, to think more favorably than you now do of our political prospects and national existence. You believe that no race of men can permanently change their locality. You say that the colonization of Northern America "is a problem, whose success cannot reasonably be believed." You imagine you can perceive the signs of deterioration already "in the early loss of the subcutaneous adipose cushion." You tell us, in rather a swaggering way, that "the United States men have forgotten who they are, and fancy themselves *Americans*, because they choose to call themselves so. Is the boasted Union to be permanent? It must come to a half-dozen monarchies at last,—a king of New York, a Leopold installed in Kentucky, an Otho in Michigan, a liberal despotism under a prince of the noble house of Brunswick or Brandenburg." At any rate, not Brunswick or Brandenburg, if you please, most learned prophet. Be all these things as they will, however; and, leaving the future to the care of that Divine Providence which you seem to hold in so much contempt, we are sure of one thing, that you will not find in any portion of our land that "rancorous and eternal hatred for the parent kingdom," that "abhorrence of her and her rotten institutions," which you so glibly and with such a filial piety describe.

The reprinting of this book does no credit to its publishers. In the first place, because of the wild character of the performance. In the second place, because of the extremely inaccurate and slovenly manner in which it is printed. We have counted ten blunders on one page, the 143d. As for such phrases as "Cicero's defence of Flaccus for misconduct," and such assertions as the march of Alexander the Great "five hundred years before our Saviour," we shall leave author and proof-reader to share the burden between them. We must declare, that the motto "quæ prosunt omnibus," which figures upon the title-page round the rim of a shield with the winged Caduceus for its device, was never more inappropriately placed.

Lavengro; the Scholar, — the Gypsy, — the Priest. By GEORGE BORROW, Author of "The Bible in Spain," and "The Gypsies of Spain." New York: G. P. Putnam. 1851. 12mo. pp. 550.

THIS is a remarkable, but most unsatisfactory book. The public had a right to expect something better from Mr. Borrow. The fragments of personal history with which his former works were checkered excited some interest as to his early adventures. He seemed to have strayed in many lands and to have learned many tongues. To a keen eye, cool courage, and a stout will, he added a roving disposition and an insatiable thirst for adventure; and the marvels which he related were not always less marvellous when his story was done. In this book we hoped to find some curious and even valuable reminiscences of his wide and various travels, and an explanation of the anomalous features of his former works. His veracity has been impugned, but on some startling points most strikingly confirmed. In this book he had an opportunity to make every thing clear. But "Lavengro" is mystery worse mystified. The author keeps incredulous critics at bay by assuming an amphibious character, half real and half romantic, now running wild, as it would seem, in the most vagrant extravagance, and now settling down into honest and matter-of-fact biography. He gives us the place of his birth and takes us with him to the scenes in which his youth was passed. Old Norwich is easily recognized, and the portrait of William Taylor is not to be mistaken.* Other characters,

* The following is an extract from a letter of William Taylor to Robert Southey, written in 1821:—

"A young man is construing with me Schiller's William Tell, with the view of translating it for the press. His name is George Henry Borrow. He has learned German with extraordinary rapidity; indeed, he has the

we doubt not, are drawn from life, and some of them with great truth and spirit. But Mr. Borrow's cookery is in the French style, — highly spiced and equivocal.

What good end is to be answered by this book, it is not easy to imagine. And yet it seems to have had more than one object. The author tells us, that "among the many things attempted in this book is the encouragement of charity and free and genial manners, and the exposure of humbug, of which there are various kinds, but of which the most perfidious, the most debasing, and the most cruel, is the humbug of the Priest." That "free manners" will suffer nothing at the hands of a writer, whose "most entertaining character" is a gypsy, and who professes all due regard for such as are "proper men with their hands," and affectionately apostrophizes the bruisers and blood-horses of Old England, is credible. As to "humbug," of which there are indeed various kinds, a preacher less prodigal in wonders might be more edifying. "Charity," we presume, will not find Mr. Borrow out of the reach of a generous requital of his services.

"Let no one think," says our author in his characteristic preface, "that irreligion is advocated in this book." Of course no one will suspect an ex-missionary of the Bible Society of that. But few will impute to "Lavengro" the contrary extreme. For the book has a good share of heathenish scenes and irreligious characters. Prizefighters and cockfighters and jockeys and gypsies and "flaming tinmen" are showered upon us, for no reason that appears, except to show that "no countries are less known by the British than these 'selfsame British Islands,'" — a blissful ignorance, perhaps, in this instance. But Mr. Borrow, we trust, has shaken the refuse wheat out of his bag, and will yet open to us a more profitable store. He has discharged his debt to the "Gypsy"; and charity will excuse him from meddling again with the "Priests" of a church which he hates so heartily as he does the Romish. He has much to tell us yet, and he knows how to tell it well. Of his descriptive power there can be no question, and the best scenes of this strange book are executed in a manner which proves that the author needs only a more self-denying use of his resources. When we hear from him again, we hope he will inform us how he became a Christian and a missionary.

gift of tongues, and though not yet eighteen, understands twelve languages; English, Welsh, Erse, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, German, Danish, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese. He would like to get into the office for Foreign Affairs, but does not know how." — *Memoirs of W. Taylor*, II. 496.

Christ in Hades: a Poem. By WILLIAM W. LORD. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1851. 16mo. pp. 183.

THE learning, thought, and constructive force of imagination shown in this production are far above mediocrity. The doctrine, or legend, on which it is based, though now neglected, was once, and for long, a prominent part of the theology of Christendom; the feature in the prevailing interpretation of our religion which perhaps more than any other allied the Christian creeds to the ethnic mythologies. For the sake of the information it affords, and the light it sheds on several obscure views rapidly fading from the popular mind, as well as on account of the poetic enjoyment to be derived from its perusal, we trust Mr. Lord's poem will find a large number of readers. This work can be reviewed with severe censure, and without praise,—as we have seen it hastily reviewed,—only by one who either judges it by an inapplicable standard, or utterly fails to appreciate its merits, while he exaggerates its sins. True, it has defects and faults, which, in a searching critical estimate, would demand notice, and would somewhat modify the commendation we bestow upon it.

The Casars. By THOMAS DE QUINCEY, Author of "Confessions of an English Opium-Eater," etc., etc. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 295.

THIS volume embraces the whole of the well-known papers under this title contributed by Mr. De Quincey to Blackwood's Magazine some seventeen or eighteen years since, and forms the fourth volume of the collected edition of his miscellaneous works. It is written with great brilliancy, and well exhibits the encyclopedic character of the author's mind, and that happy command of language which is found in all his writings, while it has fewer defects than some of his other productions. In speaking of Hazlitt, he somewhere complains that his writings want continuity. But the same defect is equally apparent in his own case. His mind, like Hazlitt's, is eminently discursive; and in all of his works that have fallen under our notice there is a disposition to pass off from the main subject and discuss collateral questions. In truth, the peculiar bent of his mind leads him to follow every new vein of thought that may be opened in the course of his remarks; and the reader is continually drawn away from the main subject to consider questions which, though interesting and important in themselves, are not always very closely connected with the point at issue. We see this tendency in the work now before us, where, instead of confining himself

to a strictly historical or biographical survey of the Cæsars, our author is constantly entering upon an examination of some incidental topic connected with the history of Rome, which interrupts the flow of his narrative and not unfrequently perplexes the reader's mind by distracting his attention. These digressions, however, are often admirable, and sometimes materially assist the reader in arriving at a correct understanding of the principal question. Nothing, indeed, can be more sound, judicious, and weighty, than the observations on the causes of the decline and fall of the Roman empire in the third chapter. Other points are discussed with equal clearness and vigor; and on the whole we are inclined to regard this as one of the best of Mr. De Quincey's numerous works.

We are greatly indebted to Mr. Fields for his editorial taste and care in collecting from various sources these admirable contributions to our literature. We are looking forward with high expectations to the three volumes which are promised us of De Quincey's Autobiographical Papers.

Foreign Reminiscences, by HENRY RICHARD LORD HOLLAND.

Edited by his Son, HENRY EDWARD LORD HOLLAND. London: Longman, Brown, Green, & Longmans. 1850. Post 8vo. pp. 362.

C. C. Smith

EVEN if these Reminiscences were less entertaining and instructive than they really are, we should be still interested in them from a recollection of the illustrious name which their author inherited, and of the distinguished position which he himself held among the statesmen of England during the last half-century. Henry Richard Fox, third Lord Holland, was born in November, 1773, and succeeded to the barony when he was only a year old. In his youth he travelled on the Continent and remained abroad some time; so that his Parliamentary career did not commence until 1798. But from his first entrance into public life he distinguished himself by an earnest and eloquent advocacy of those principles which his uncle, the Right Honorable Charles James Fox, was maintaining with unequalled ability in the other House; and until his death, in October, 1840, he continued their steady and consistent supporter. Indeed, we cannot now recall any liberal measure which he did not advocate, nor any act of injustice and oppression which he did not resist. Nor are we aware that any stain rests on his course as a statesman. The early part of his private life, however, was marked by some flagrant vices; and indications of their effect upon his mind may doubtless be seen in several of the anecdotes in the present

volume. He inherited much of the ability of his family; and Holland House was the resort of all the eminent literary men of his party, who were attracted there by the learning, wit, and rare social qualities of their host. During his life he published biographies of Lope de Vega and Guillen de Castro, and several translations and pamphlets, besides writing numerous protests which were entered upon the journals of the House of Lords; and, as we learn by references in the present work, he has left a manuscript memoir of his own times, which we trust will be given to the public at some future period. The Reminiscences exhibit most of the qualities which we anticipated in them. They are written in an easy, gossiping style; and if they present little that is positively new, they are valuable and interesting for giving the views of one so well qualified to judge of men and measures as Lord Holland, and for the fund of curious anecdotes which they contain.

C.

Twice-Told Tales. By NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE. In Two Volumes. A New Edition. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 287, 288.

The House of the Seven Gables, a Romance. By NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 344. C. C. Smith

THE *Twice-Told Tales* were the first fruits of Mr. Hawthorne's genius; and their simple beauty and quiet pathos are doubtless familiar to many of our readers. They display the same mental characteristics that he has shown in his later works; and in the present elegant edition, which is enriched with an original Preface and a finely engraved head of the author, they can hardly fail of finding many new admirers.

In the Preface to *The House of the Seven Gables*, our author claims for the book "a certain latitude, both as to its fashion and material, which he would not have felt himself entitled to assume, had he professed to be writing a Novel"; and he further tells us, that "it has been no part of his object, however, to describe local manners, nor in any way to meddle with the characteristics of a community for whom he cherishes a proper respect and a natural regard." He has, however, a moral constantly in view, which is, to show that "the wrong-doing of one generation lives into the successive ones, and, divesting itself of every temporary advantage, becomes a pure and uncontrollable mischief"; and the same idea is presented once and again in the course of the romance itself. The work whose character and aim are thus described is a production of great power,

though inferior in interest to *The Scarlet Letter*. The impression which it leaves on the reader's mind is, indeed, much pleasanter than that produced by its predecessor; but its plot is more complex, the characterization more exaggerated, and the artistic execution less perfect. Viewed as a whole, it will stand much higher than when considered in its separate parts; for the general outline is well conceived, but the filling up is not of equal excellence. There is too much of disquisition, and too little of narrative and dialogue. Consequently we have fewer descriptive passages of so great beauty and so tender pathos as we find in *The Scarlet Letter* and in some of the *Twice-Told Tales*, while there are scattered through the volume many sparkling gems of thought and incidental sketches of character which are alike striking and admirable. It will add to Mr. Hawthorne's reputation, and be greatly admired by a large class of readers.

We may say here, what we should have said at greater length had we noticed *The Scarlet Letter*, that it contains the grossest and foulest falsification of truth in history and personal character, that we have ever encountered, in romance or narrative.

H. T. Tuckerman

Poems, by HENRY THEODORE TUCKERMAN. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. pp. 176.

We cannot extol the prevailing strain of poetry among us. Mostly — of course we except the names of our few poetic princes — it is of that indolent sort which one trims to a pattern, or weaves for the amusement of a refined leisure. It wants vividness. It wants depth. It wants clearness and force. We miss all the higher inspirations of the divine art. It has no sufficient reason for coming into public existence. Mr. Tuckerman's lines are as good, and a great deal better, than much that is called poetry. But they seem to us, we reluctantly confess, to fall short of a very high or distinct character. Their thought is too vague, and their style too conventional. The imagery is of the old, familiar kind. The language is graceful, but diffuse. The writer is evidently a gentleman of sensibility and delicate culture. We should love to be with him in some of the travelled spots that he describes. But we are ready to suspect that Wordsworth, a selection from whose works he edited not a great while ago, has beguiled him into a feeble, if not a false, estimate of what makes any composition really poetical. We say these things with entire respect for the author. We are sorry to be called on to declare our judgment, in connection with any publication of his, that every one who aspires to be a poet in this country should not be content with prettiness and commonplace

sentiment, but throw heart and soul into the task. He should not write the smallest piece without a determinate object, and a well-defined conception of what he wants to express. He should insist that it shall carry the stamp as of a signet upon it, and have some marked quality of its own.

Mr. Tuckerman's versification is generally smooth and musical, though with a very few strange exceptions. For example:—

“ Here a stranger stood in mute observance.”

“ There an artist leaned, and pleased his eye.”

“ And an eye exultant with high purpose.”

“ There are rooms whose walls are radiant still.”

What sort of decasyllables are these? They all occur on the thirty-second page.

True poetry is a rare and precious thing; and every one who reaches after its honors should devote to every fresh attempt his best care and the full vigor of his mind. He has no right to be slovenly, and it is not his wisdom to speak when he has little or nothing to say. We feel compelled to write a little earnestly on this subject. We call for a loftier standard of criticism upon it than is at present in fashion. If a poem is purely didactic, or merely sportive, it is amenable to the rules that belong to its class. But we maintain, as a general principle, that no poetry is worthy of the name,—none worth the trouble that it costs to be written or read,—that does not either rouse the minds or touch and warm the hearts of thoughtful men.

The Poetical and Prose Writings of Charles Sprague. New and revised Edition. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1850. 12mo. pp. 205.

We hope it is not too late to say a few words upon this beautiful volume. Very few need be said of a poet, who won his pure fame, and took his endeared place in our poetry, a good while ago. This is the first edition of his writings published by himself. Ten years ago, the Messrs. Francis, understanding that a collection of Mr. Sprague's works was about to be undertaken in a way not likely to be perfectly satisfactory to his friends, assumed the task themselves; and the result was an octavo volume, very creditable both to the publisher and printer. This volume Mr. Sprague would take no interest or part in, though he made no objection to its appearing. We are glad to receive a fresh and enlarged edition from his own hand. The book is so full of delicate skill and the truest feeling, that it will always be in demand, and live an affectionate kind of life in the old country, as well as in our own. Prefixed to it is an engraved portrait of the

author, which alone would give this new edition great value in our eyes. We will not call it a speaking likeness, only because we would rather call it his quietly meditative self. So we have seen him sit and look a hundred times, and hope to repeat the pleasure as many times more.

But this is not the only debt we are under to the present volume. It has added four pieces to the former collection, — an Installation Hymn, Children's Hymn, The Tomb of Emeline, and Charles James. The last of these, upon the death of the first-born son, is one of the most touching strains that have ever been allowed to flow out from the heart's deep sorrow upon the public ear. We give the whole a tardy, but a most hearty welcome. We do not believe that the poetic fire has gone down in so warm a breast as that of our bard. We earnestly exhort him to fan again for others the divine glow that is in him; and we will promise to be among the first to meet and greet him, when he comes again, with such bays as we have.

7-17 J. E. E. H. H.

A Guide to the Scientific Knowledge of Things Familiar. By Rev. Dr. BREWER, Trinity Hall, Cambridge. Carefully revised and adapted for Use in Families and Schools of the United States. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1851. 16mo. pp. 426.

THE title of this useful little book is a sufficient index of its contents. Its character and object are every way commendable, and its execution is very happy. Electricity, Thunder and Lightning, Heat, Rain, Snow, Light, and the Chemistry of Nature and of Art, are here revealed in their wonderful operations, and turned to many household uses of pleasant information and profit.

10

The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral. By Rev. JAMES M'COSE. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851. 8vo. pp. 515.

THIS is a reprint of an English work, of which an elaborate and very laudatory notice appeared lately in the North British Review. We think that the commendation is on the whole well deserved. The author discusses the old topics of natural religion and metaphysical theology, and he does it in a clear, strong, and masterly manner, investing them with fresh interest, from the fulness of his resources, and the clear presentment of his points. He finds the Fall and the intended Restoration of man recognized in all the laws of nature and all the ways of Prov-

idence. In this hypothesis, or, as he would say, this fact, he finds the solution of all the mysteries of the universe, and of human nature and destiny. While we must dissent from some of our author's views, we acknowledge ourselves indebted to him for a high intellectual enjoyment; and we commend his book to such persons as have an appetite for a dish of strong and well-garnished Scotch metaphysics. We do not remember any recent writer of his class, of whose mental powers, philosophical spirit, and general fitness to treat great questions, we have received so favorable an impression.

//

Notes on North America, Agricultural, Economical, and Social.

By JAMES F. W. JOHNSTON, Reader in Chemistry and Mineralogy in the University of Durham. Boston: Little & Brown. 1851. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 415, 512.

PROFESSOR JOHNSTON will be known to many of our readers as having delivered a course of lectures before the Lowell Institute in 1850, on the "Relations of Science to Agriculture." His especial purpose in his visit to this continent was to pursue investigations connected with his favorite topic, and his "Notes" are in great part devoted to the results of his inquiries. New Brunswick, the Canadas, New York, and a portion of New England, were the field of his most careful observations, and the statistics of agriculture and general economics, with comparative estimates between different regions and different methods, are presented with much care and fidelity. It will thus appear that the author does not follow in the track of the English tourists who have preceded him, but has opened an original and most profitable subject of international interest. He has reciprocated the enterprise which the late Mr. Colman pursued in Great Britain. We have turned over his pages with high satisfaction, and we believe that they will engage the attention of our farmers and scientific agriculturists to some good purpose. There is a vast deal to be learned on this subject, and experiment and comparison are the two great sources of improvement.

The author's incidental remarks on society, manners, and religion among us are for the most part very correct and discriminating. He does not conceal his strong English predilections; indeed, we admire the candor with which he expresses them, and wherever he expresses an opinion unfavorable to us, we can see how it arises from imperfect knowledge and limited observation, so far as the opinion is unjust, and we are ready to accede to it so far as it is true. We have noticed some little inaccuracies, like the following. "In the cities, from eight to twelve

hundred dollars are given [as a minister's salary], and in rare cases, or to especial favorites, fifteen hundred." No city minister has less than fifteen hundred, and the "especial favorites" have more than double that salary. "There are thirteen Protestant Episcopal churches in Boston." We know of but seven. Professor Johnston is mistaken in supposing that King's Chapel, "in consequence of some endowments, still retains something of the form of the Episcopal service."

We are pleased to see that he does justice to Dr. Charles T. Jackson, in ascribing to him the discovery and announcement of the principle of etherization.

12

Christ in Theology; being the Answer of the Author, before the Hartford Central Association of Ministers, October, 1849, for the Doctrines of the Book entitled "God in Christ." By HORACE BUSHNELL. Hartford: Brown & Parsons. 1851. 12mo. pp. 348.

THIS volume, with the Preliminary Dissertation on Language in the author's former volume, taken in connection with Professor Park's Convention Sermon and his controversy with his Princeton Reviewer, give us a very significant index of the issue now raised between two parties in the Orthodox fold in New England. At the opening of the Unitarian controversy, forty years ago, the phrase "figurative language" was made use of by the Liberal party to a degree which excited both the remonstrances and the ridicule of their opponents. We are mistaken if Professor Park and Dr. Bushnell do not find the phrase more convenient than did our own brethren. Certain it is that these two influential and much honored divines find something in the bald, literal statement of Calvinism, even in the terms of Scripture phraseology, which greatly exercises their spirits. To soften and qualify, to dignify and rectify their verbal formulas, by distinguishing between the literal, intellectual verity and the emotional exaggeration that may be respectively conveyed in the same phrase, is the evident desire of both these divines. They are most unquestionably justified in the distinction on which they insist. Dr. Bushnell reviews, under the same divisions, the topics of his former work, embracing his essay on Language and his three Discourses on Christ, the Trinity, and the Atonement. There is a manliness, an earnestness, and a dignity in his plea, which, united with a masterly use of the new-fashioned philosophical phraseology, give to his volume a freshness that carries the reader through its most unedifying and barren discussions. The treatment of the themes is wholly remote from the intellectual reach or the practical use of ninety-nine in each

hundred of the Christian fold. We think we have understood a small portion of the volume. The most intelligible sentence in it is the following : — “ I frankly own to you, that I accept no prevailing view of Trinity now held in New England.” (p. 170.)

Characteristics of Literature, illustrated by the Genius of Distinguished Writers. By HENRY T. TUCKERMAN. Second Series. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1851. 12mo. pp. 282.

MR. TUCKERMAN'S prose has all the good qualities of his poetry, with more of vigor, of manliness, and of all the intellectual faculties than we find in most of his rhythmical pieces. He is an elegant scholar, a man of rich culture, equally well furnished, too, in pure and tender and lofty sentiment. He has nice powers of analysis and discrimination, he uses a metaphor to good advantage, and can illustrate his views and positions in a way which proves their correctness and enforces their lessons. In the volume before us, eleven distinguished literary names stand as the exponents of the same number of departments of mental exercise and power. Thus, Manzoni represents the Novelist; Steele, the Censor; Humboldt, the Naturalist; Madame de Sévigné, the Correspondent; Horne Tooke, the Philologist; Wilson, the Magazine-Writer; Talfourd, the Dramatist; Beckford, the Traveller; Hazlitt, the Critic; Everett, the Orator; Godwin, the Reformer. It will be seen at once that the author does not design to treat each of these men as the most distinguished exponent or representative of the respective themes. It is more for the convenience of apportioning to them their due awards, through comparison with others, that he distinguishes one figure in each group of marked men. We have found the author eminently just and tolerant in his criticisms. He has no narrow prejudices to serve, no exclusive principles to maintain. We can commend this and his former volume as very valuable and instructive additions to the increasing library of essayists.

Louisiana; its Colonial History and Romance. By CHARLES GAYARRE. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851. Svo. pp. 546.

THE excessively bad taste displayed in the Preface of this book, and the confession of the haste with which it was prepared, may perhaps deprive the author of many readers who would be attracted by his subject. Of the accuracy of its treat-

ment in details we are not qualified to judge. The author, who was prevented by ill health from taking the seat in the United States Senate to which he had been elected, was afterwards the Secretary of the State of Louisiana. He wields a skilful pen, and with a vigorous and animated style. We should judge that there is more of romance than of history in his pages, and, indeed, we cannot decide how much he expects or wishes us to receive as absolute verity. His theme, however, with its Indian, Spanish, and French incidents and actors, is wildly romantic, even in its clearly historical elements.

15
Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship and Travels. From the German of Goethe. A New Edition, revised. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1851. 16mo. 2 vols. pp. 495, 482.

THIS is the first complete translation of Goethe's most popular work that has ever appeared in this country, while the portion of it which had twice been printed here has long been "out of print,"—an expression which means, not to be had at the bookstores. The variety of matter, in theme and incident, in criticism and narrative, which Goethe contrived to work up in many of his nondescript productions, is realized in this work in a way which always instructs and most often pleases. Under the form of a German student's or artisan's probationary drilling at his profession, and subsequent wanderings abroad to enlarge his sphere of life and thought, we have presented to us a medley of brilliant observations, of grotesque occurrences, and of profound criticisms, enough to make the staple of a dozen more methodical tales. The offensive characteristics of Goethe appear less in this than in several other of his productions. We regard this neat edition as a choice contribution to that noble collection of volumes for which our present readers are indebted to the enterprising and liberal firm, the members of which know something more about books than their merchantable value.

16
The Works of Horace; with English Notes. For the Use of Schools and Colleges. By J. L. LINCOLN, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in Brown University. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 12mo. pp 575.

THIS is the best edition of Horace within our reach, whether for the tyro's task or for the scholar's enjoyment. Professor Lincoln has performed his work with admirable taste, and with excellent judgment. The apparatus which he has furnished is

gathered from all good sources, as well as from the results of his own labors. His *Life of Horace* is made to gleam with brilliant illustrations from the poems, and the poems are vivified by their connection with the personality and habitudes of the Venusian bard. The notes seem to us to keep the happy medium between that excess which does the student's work for him, and that niggardliness which is relaxed only for pedantic comment. The large, clear type of the book is a blessing to jaded eyes. We mean to read our favorite classic again, to show our appreciation of this edition.

17
 *** JOHN P. JEWETT & Co. have published a new edition of the famous *Century Sermon* of the Rev. Nathaniel Howe, of Hopkinton, with a *Prefatory Sketch of his Life, Character, and Ministry*, which was not to be had before. This *Sermon*, which has been a means of amusing interest among our ministers and laymen for more than thirty years, is a most original and racy document. It is one of the oddities of New England literature, though it has also higher characteristics. Many persons, after perusing it in an old borrowed and well-nigh worn-out copy, have expressed a strong desire to possess it. They can now be gratified.

The same publishers have sent us, "*The Grand Issue: an Ethico-Political Tract. By Samuel Willard.*" 8vo. pp. 37. This is an earnest protest, by the venerable and sightless minister of Deerfield, against the *Fugitive Slave Law*. It is the most mild and Christian in its temper of any of the numerous pamphlets upon that pregnant theme which we have perused. After examining the Scripture rule of action in a case of collision between Divine and human law, the author argues that the Constitution does not give Congress any power to legislate for the restoration of fugitive slaves, and that no sound reason of wisdom or policy can be urged for it. He then appeals to the South to say whether it has kept the conditions of the national compact, and he condemns in conclusion the having recourse to any measure of resistance to law which shall involve force, or any thing but patient suffering of persecution.

"*The City of the Silent: a Poem, by W. Gilmore Simms, delivered at the Consecration of Magnolia Cemetery, November 19, 1850.*" Charleston: Walker & James. 8vo. pp. 54. A poem of much merit, solemn and wise in its tones, with appropriate imagery, and a spirit befitting the occasion. Why are not poems rather than prose composition more commonly made the

vehicle of sentiment at the consecration of our cemeteries? We think such an occasion far more suited to the most touching and elevating strains of poetry, and far more likely to insure a good poem, than are our literary anniversaries.

“Popery : British and Foreign. By Walter Savage Landor.” London : Chapman & Hall. 1851. 12mo. pp. 63. This little squib, which has been shot off again in this country by Ticknor, Reed, & Fields, has disappointed us. There is more smoke than power in it. We looked, from the genius of the author, to have received something more worthy of his pen on a subject which we are told called forth in England one hundred and eighty publications in one month. Some sentences, however, are equally spicy and plain ; for instance, — “ Exactly in proportion to its distance from Popery is a nation industrious, free, and moral.” England is “ divided into high church and low church : the Church of Christ is neither ; few clergymen know that ; none preach it. In the present day the Papists call themselves Catholics, the Protestants in England call themselves the same. Both lie, and both know they lie ; yet neither will give up the point.”

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review for April, 1851. — The printing of this Orthodox quarterly having been transferred from Princeton to Philadelphia, its form and appearance have greatly improved. With its respectable scholarship and its Calvinistic theology, it combines a solid good sense and much vigor in the treatment of religious and literary topics. We have in the number before us the following articles : — 1. An Essay on Foreign Missions and Millenarianism, which rejects the popular conception of the doctrine of the Millennium, and looks for the fulfilment of the true vision to the accomplishment of the whole work, — so well begun, so propitious in its progress, so inviting and sure in its final results, — the work of Christian Missions. — 2. A Sketch of the Life, Character, and Labors of Ecolampadius, the Reformer of Basle. This is founded upon the biography recently published by a book society at Neufchatel, from the pen of Dr. Herzog. A very interesting and discriminating view is here presented, and we are again made to realize the marvellous variety of gifts and talents in that company of men, scattered all over Europe, and all known to each other, who were raised up by God at an era when they were so necessary for a peculiar work. How long must we wait for a biography of Ulric Zwingle, the most truly liberal-minded and serene of all the Re-

formers! Our reviews have recently devoted many pages to a reëxamination of the respective merits of the Reformers, but many fresh points remain to be more thoroughly investigated. Mr. Dyer's *Life of John Calvin* has called out a storm of invective, but, as far as we can form a fair judgment in the case, the candor and integrity of his pen, and the authenticity of his testimonies, still stand without being justly impugned or invalidated. Dr. Henry's *Life of Calvin* has now been translated in England, and reprinted in this country. M. Audin, the Roman Catholic biographer of the Reformers, and one of the least scrupulous of controversialists, has recently died. — 3. A *Sketch of the Life of Socrates*, written with a prosaic honesty, and from a Christian point of view. What with the help of Plato, Schleiermacher, Dr. Wiggers, and Mr. Grote, we are now able to form a fair estimate of the Athenian sage. Our reviewer reminds us, that, among the other sins for which the stage has to answer, is that of having aided, through "The Clouds of Aristophanes," in bringing about the death of Socrates. There is a slight professional tinge in this article, indicated by the suggestion of the shortcomings and limitations of philosophy even in one of its master minds. Is it strictly true, that, while Socrates was reasoning upon a future life, he stumbled "at straws," and was "perplexed with things made so plain in Scripture, that a little child in a Christian family knows them"! — 4. The Absurdities of certain Modern Theories of Education, is the title of an article which greatly commends itself by plain speaking about much of the cant of the age, and by urging the true process for the education of the mind. We agree with all that the writer says upon the theories with high-sounding titles, — such as "the inductive system," "the productive," "the analytical," "the development," "the self-educating" systems, — which pretend to facilitate the work of teaching. There never was, and there never will be, but one effective system of teaching, and that is to engage the mind of the learner, and to convey to it something that could not be developed from it. — 5. The True Test of an Apostolical Ministry, is the title of a very candid article, based wholly upon Scriptural warrants fairly interpreted and applied. Its conclusion is, "that the primary and paramount criterion of an Apostolic ministry is conformity of doctrine to the Apostolic standard." — In the 6th and concluding article, Professor Park's reviewer returns to the attack upon that very significant Discourse on the Theology of the Intellect and the Theology of the Feelings. The reply to the Remarks of the Professor on his reviewer adds nothing to the substance of the controversy, but it certainly widens the breach between the Old School and the New, and by the acute discrimination between sentimental or rhetorical orthodoxy and the literalism of the old standards, it presents to us the same old issue under a new terminology.

The Prospective Review, No. 25, February, 1851. — The present number of this thin, but rich, quarterly is one of uncommon excellence. We are sorry that its able editors are obliged to preface it with an account of the diminished circulation of the work, and with an appeal to the public for a wider patronage. "They can no longer sustain," they say, "the pecuniary loss, and will need a considerable accession of subscribers to enable them to carry on the undertaking." This we most sincerely regret to hear, and hope that their appeal will not be in vain, in behalf of a work that holds so high a character.

The first article, on Kenrick's "Ancient Egypt under the Pharaohs,"

is a sober paper on a subject that is still beset with doubts and puzzles, which correspond but poorly to the immense pretensions often advanced. The second, on Maurice's Sermons, "The Church a Family," is interesting and well done. It denies the possibility that the title of the book can be realized and its claim made good. The only doubt that has arisen in our minds, with regard to this and some other writings in a similar strain, is, whether in the zeal of dissent they may not have exaggerated a little the sacerdotal element in the English Church establishment. We must acknowledge, however, that they who feel the pinch have the best right to cry out. We next have a most reasonable and readable paper on a new edition of Yates's "Vindication of Unitarianism," indicating the changes that have been going on in liberal opinion since the work was first published, in 1815. The glory of this number, however, lies in the fourth article, "Europe since the Reformation." Without quoting largely, we could give our readers no idea of its close reasoning and superb rhetoric. It is candid and impassioned at the same time. We hardly know which most to admire, the keenness of its logic, or the splendor of its picturesque and learned style. We think we cannot err in ascribing it to the pen of Mr. Martineau. Charmed as we have been with his two magnificent articles in the Westminster Review, "The Church of England" and "The Battle of the Churches," we account this inferior to neither of them; and of course to no one of the eloquent productions which the warmth of the present Catholic controversy in England has stimulated. We commend it earnestly to readers of every description, who would be instructed in history, or who take any interest in the aspects of the time, or who can be entertained with the music of the most accomplished discourse.

The closing article, on Wordsworth's "Prelude," we must say, appears not quite worthy of the company with which it is associated. It is written in rather an inflated way, and contains a great deal of commonplace finery, — reminding us of a thin gauze robe stiff with spangles. The author displays a violent enthusiasm for French liberty, which sounds oddly at our time of the day. Several turgid periods bear witness to this. As for Mr. Wordsworth's right to be called "a mighty Poetical Revolutionist," we much question it. At any rate, "the mighty enterprise which cast down the gaudy throne of Darwin, and broke the feeble sceptre of Hayley," could not be much to speak of. Hayley, as a versifier, never had any ability to reign or to continue to live; and Dr. Darwin's throne, if there was ever such a thing, could be held up by Miss Anna Seward and a few admirers but a very short time, and crumbled into nothing of itself. Mr. Wordsworth's poetical rank will be differently assigned according to different tastes. For our own part, we were never able to set it very high. We remain unconverted from the opinion that we entertained of him when his poetry first appeared. To us he is, with here and there a fine exception, pretty uniformly prosaic, — a moralizer rather than a bard. A few cantos of glorious old Sir Walter, — to mention no other or greater, — we should prefer to the whole burden of the Prelude, and the whole length of the Excursion, though they were both spun out into as many lines as they contain letters.

Messrs. Little & Brown have received from England a very elegant but cheap edition (the thirty-sixth) of Keble's Christian Year. This volume is probably well known to most of our readers, as embracing a

series of lyrical compositions on Scripture texts or mottoes, adapted to the Sundays and other sacred days of the year, arranged according to the calendar of the Episcopal Church. Some of the pieces have already found their way into our hymn-books. The whole volume is a rich, though not wholly unexceptionable, source of devotional culture.

John P. Jewett & Co. have published, in a very neat form, the third volume of the American edition of Grote's History of Greece, from the second London edition. More attention has been given in this volume to the correction of typographical errors. We have already spoken in high terms of the merits of this History, and hope that the enterprise of the American publishers will be so richly repaid, that they will be able to do justice to the author, whose labors they are legally free to appropriate.

Messrs Charles S. Francis & Co. of New York announce as in press, The Writings of Alexander Hamilton, and solicit subscriptions on terms which will give a subscriber an advantage over a subsequent purchaser. The work will embrace seven volumes, printed chiefly from manuscripts purchased by Congress, and of the highest historical value.

The Messrs. Harper are publishing, in semi-monthly numbers (of which four have thus far appeared), a work filled with original materials for such scenes as characterize the writings of Dickens and Thackeray. The title is, "London Labor and the London Poor, a Cyclopædia of the Social Condition and Earnings of Those that will work, Those that cannot work, and Those that will not work, in the British Metropolis. By Henry Mayhew." The author's contributions to the London Morning Chronicle have proved his eminent qualifications to treat his original theme with skill and faithfulness.

The same publishers have issued the fifth in their series of the Franconia Stories, and a very pleasant and instructive series it is for the young. The last is entitled "Beechnut."

The Monthly Magazine issued by this firm has attained to an unrivalled popularity. The variety of its contents adapts it to many different tastes, and if a reader peruses only a quarter of the contents of each number he receives an equivalent for the cost of the whole.

Messrs. Phillips, Sampson, & Co. have published thirty-eight parts of their beautiful edition of Shakspeare. Two more parts will complete the work, which is certainly as cheap and valuable an edition of the great dramatist as was ever put forth.

Besides the works which we have already announced as in press by this firm is the following, — "Sketches of European Cities," by Rev. William Ware. We suppose this will embrace, with other matter, the rich and scholarly lectures which have been delivered by the author.

Messrs. Crosby and Nichols have in press the following: — Thoughts on Self-culture, addressed to Women. By Maria G. Grey, and her Sister, Emily Shirreff. 1 vol. 12mo. A book which has received high commendation from English critics. — A Treatise on the Christian Religion. By Athanase Coquerel. Translated from the French. A brief, but very comprehensive essay. — Closet Prayers, original and compiled from the Writings of Eminent and Holy Men of various Churches. By

Thomas Sadler. Mr. Sadler is one of the most efficient and esteemed of our brethren in England. We received a copy of the English edition of his little devotional volume, but too late to notice it in this number.— A cheap edition of the Life of Dr. Channing, in three volumes, 12mo, with two portraits, uniform with the Works, and to be furnished at one dollar and a half the set. This last work is now ready, and will be gladly received by many who could not purchase it at the original price.

H. Sadler

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

The Pope.—The Papal “institutions contain in themselves the elements of collision and disorder, and must necessarily form a system in which despotism and anarchy are mingled. It is, therefore, almost impossible to imagine a pontifical government at the same time strong and well ordered.”

An obstacle is put in the way of “the organization of the government by the state of public opinion, — a state which is manifested with a perseverance unexampled in all classes of the population in relation to the actual condition of things. We must not conclude from this aversion, so strongly manifested, that the population of the Roman States is infected with the revolutionary spirit. With the exception of a fickle crowd, such as one sees in agitation more or less over all Europe, and which in the Roman States prevailed *only through the feebleness and disorganization of the government*, the generality of the population abhors the Mazzinian régime, which has left behind it no agreeable reminiscences. The higher classes demand a government strong and regular, like that of the other European states. At the present moment they despair of obtaining it.”

This is the language of an Austrian organ in Italy. Interpret these words as we have of late learned to interpret the language of Austrian diplomacy, and they read, “The Papal temporal sovereignty has outlived its time, and we are determined to supplant it.” Accordingly, Austrian battalions are planting themselves in the States of the Church, to enforce the policy of the cabinet of Vienna. When, some time since, the Pope was recreating at Gaeta, it was arranged that Spanish troops should occupy Spoleto and Terni, but the Spaniards have now evacuated those towns, and the Austrians hold them in their possession. Under feeble pretexts, which an ambitious power knows so well how to trump up, they have garrisoned Terni, the birthplace of Tacitus, and thrown soldiers into the celebrated Franciscan convent at the beautiful town of Assise. Their troops are permanently stationed but an easy two days’ march from Rome, and another journal says, “The Austrians continue to invade the country.” Italy’s too “fatal gift of beauty” will soon prove an apple of discord among her foreign invaders. In the North, the Austrians have long “shed her blood and drank the tears of her distress,” and now the parental government which has conquered Lombardy and restored peace to Hungary finds time, while dictating the policy of Germany, to consider the “incapacity” of clerical dominion and the unhappy condition of the inhabitants of Central Italy. The man at the head of that cabinet is even more able, energetic, and unscrupulous than the celebrated Metternich.

In the mean time, the condition of that weak pontiff, Pius the Ninth, is

miserable in the extreme. The French are pulling the wires at the Vatican; the Austrians are drawing a strong cordon of troops around the capital, and there is not a foot of his principality which he can call his own. Soon, perhaps, he will be doomed to witness the struggle of the invaders, and to fall a passive victim into the hands of the victor.

"The stranger's sword
Is his sad weapon of defence, and so,
Victor or vanquished, he the slave of friend or foe."

The recent converts to Catholicism will probably have the satisfaction of looking up, not only to an Austrian puppet (for that has long been the case), but to an acknowledged Austrian subject, as their spiritual head. While that Church has made, in the last quarter of a century, progress which has put Protestantism to shame, and almost brought its permanency into question, it seems in a fair way to lose even its nominal temporal power. The language of the Austrian organ is not reform, — the remedy is to be a sterner one. If language means any thing, and they are permitted to carry out their purpose, we can look for nothing less than a reconstitution of the States of the Church. What will those Papists say who connect temporal power with their ideas of the Church of Christ? and what will they say if the tiara should become the gift of the Austrian Emperor, and their spiritual and infallible Head dwindle to a dependant, compelled to watch the smiles of a court for his precarious dignity? There is a singular contrast between the pitiful condition of the Pope at home, and the agitation and excitement in England on account of his "audacious aggressions."

The Hungarian Protestants. — A convention in January last, at Pesth, had in discussion two important points in the internal economy of the national church; — 1. The entire separation of the Hungarian and the Sclavonian elements. 2. The surrender of their schools to the care of the state.

The impossibility of retaining in harmony two such incongruous elements as the Sclavonian and Hungarian within the limits of one church, with no tie save that of a few points of faith in common, has long been evident. The Hungarians (or Magyars, as we must now call them) are, for the most part, rich and powerful. The Sclavonians, on the other hand, are of the poorer and middle classes. The difficulty of making an equitable division of the church property only has held them together; and, after long discussions and fruitless efforts, it has been decided to lay the matter before an impartial commissioner, appointed by the government, whose decision shall be final. The Magyars despise the Sclavonians, and the Sclavonians hate the Magyars. The Sclavonians invited a preacher to come to them, who was notorious as the leader of a band of Sclavonic volunteers in the war of the revolution; at which some of the more wealthy took umbrage, and went over to the Magyar Church. Perhaps this incident may throw some light on the state of feeling prevalent among that class of people toward the government. It is certainly true, that the Sclavonians were the first to appeal to the Austrians for help in their controversy with the Magyars, and the referee was appointed by their especial request. A still more interesting light is thrown upon their character, by the fact, that, when this military preacher had declined the office, and the parish were proceeding to vote upon another candidate, the female portion, to whom

he was especially obnoxious, not content with entering their protest at home, invaded the hall where their husbands were assembled, and declared their *ultimatum*. It was, that if this candidate should be chosen, he should have none of the fairer sex to hear him, and with this declaration these modern Spartans actually went over to pacify their indignation under the preaching of the Magyar Szekacs.

The other question, in relation to the schools, is explained by the fact, that hitherto every one of the numerous religious sects of Hungary has supported its own schools out of its own funds, and retained to itself the oversight of them; and it is to the credit of the Protestant population, that, although by no means the richest class, their schools have been, to say the least, surpassed by none. The Austrian government claims the right to assume the care of all the schools throughout the realm, and appeals to the Protestants of the Pesth military district to surrender those belonging to them, or retain them as private institutions. The convention before whom the matter is brought refuses, and bases its refusal upon two points; — 1. That the question should be brought before an assembly delegated from all Protestant Hungary. 2. That all laws of late passed are only *provisional*, destined to go through the revision of the parliament of the realm, and perhaps undergo many alterations.

The history of the Protestant Hungarian Church during the last two years is the best explanation of the second singular clause. On the success of the Austrian arms, the religious institutions of that unfortunate portion of her subjects passed with their political ones into the hands of a military dictator. The flock of Christ was intrusted to the tender mercies of Field-Marshal Baron Haynau, the hyena of Brescia, and forthwith there began to appear at Vienna the representatives of every sect that exists in Hungary, (and what sect is not to be found there?) praying for the restoration of their ancient immunities, and bewailing that their churches were governed by martial law, and *officered*, instead of watched by faithful pastors. Those hordes who had sent their picturesque soldiery to plunder the Austrian capital under Jel-lachich, now sent their picturesque prelates to sue at the footstool of that empire whose tottering fabric their hands had been the first to support. Within a few weeks of each other came to Vienna, with petitions, bishops of the Catholic Church of the East and the Catholic Church of Rome, and the adherents of Calvin and of Luther. The grievances of the Protestant Church were plain, and they were met by fair promises. From time out of mind, her affairs had been directed by conventions of elected representatives, — her instruction had gone on without interference from the state. So strongly had she insisted upon this, that, when in September, 1848, the government then in power proposed to pay both preachers and teachers out of the funds of the state, she declined, through fear that her independence might be compromised.

In 1850, a proclamation of Haynau withdrew all these rights from the Protestant Church. By power of this, Lutheran superintendents, without imputation of any political offence, were unceremoniously discharged, and the inferior officers were deprived of their places. The various conventions were dissolved, and in place of the old superintendentships were substituted military districts, whose overseers were appointed by the commander of the army. To them, and to such of the laity as they should select, were to be intrusted the affairs of the Protes-

tant Church, which was thus converted into a kind of military hierarchy. Haynau's conception of the office of religion in human affairs was evidently very limited, and he showed an ignorance of human nature, if he supposed that even a crushed and conquered people will tamely suffer their religion to be insulted. The Magyars shut a church in the face of one of these military appointed pastors, and in another place the church-members declined receiving the elements at the hands of one of them.

Under the weight of such grievances, they petitioned for a renewal of their self-governing privileges, and a reëstablishment of their institutions of instruction on the old foundation. The first has been accorded them. The second they have not yet obtained, that we are aware of; but, under the circumstances, the convention at Pesth had at least the right to hint that they were living in uncertainty, that no one need suppose the present laws permanent, but that the days might come when the old and hitherto respected rights of the realm would be returned to them.

J. E. Elliot

The Revival of the Papal Hierarchy in England.—Two Bulls were received in England near the close of the last year, one in stone, and one on parchment, but the excitement caused by the latter has far exceeded the enthusiasm which might have been expected to attend the former. One of them was the Great Bull of Nineveh, which, through Mr. Layard's exertions, has been disinterred, and, in all its old heathen hideousness, is safely deposited in the British Museum. Had it not been for the Papal Bull under the seal of "The Fisherman at Rome," which so soon followed it, there is no knowing but that the ancient pagan idol might have called forth some degree of grumbling from some offended Englishman. But the Pope's Bull has absorbed all the interest which men have to expend upon the passing occasion that most engages their feelings. Only two Englishmen have been created Cardinals of the Roman Church since the Reformation. Cardinal Wiseman, who has just been raised to that ecclesiastical rank, is the only one who has connected with his office a mission in England, and now, as Archbishop of Westminster, he is the primate of the Roman Church in England, and the metropolitan over twelve suffragan bishops, into whose sees the realm of England is divided. All this has been brought about by the aforesaid Bull of Pius the Ninth, and all the people of England who would secure the blessings of salvation through Jesus Christ are warned to subject themselves to the ecclesiastical direction of the restored hierarchy.

Our English papers are filled with narrations, letters, speeches, and the records of public proceedings and demonstrations called forth by this measure of the Pope. For the most part, the tone of all these documents is extremely passionate, not to say furious and threatening. Several side issues are raised, and, together with the main controversy, have caused a state of excitement which could hardly be surpassed if England were actually at war with the Continent. As we have perused the papers, and noted the anger, or timidity, or spite, or just feelings, which have been expressed by various classes of Englishmen, from the Prime Minister and the Archbishop of Canterbury down to the Lord Mayor of London, the parish vestries, and the street mobs on Guy Faux's day, we have had suggested to our minds a somewhat similar excitement growing out of a somewhat similar cause, which, nearly a

century ago, agitated the good people of the Colony of Massachusetts. If the field which was covered by the excitement here was narrower and the ground of apprehension a whit less visionary, — which latter supposition we should doubt, — the feeling, the stout-hearted and resolute feeling, which was aroused in Massachusetts on the occasion to which we refer, was as sternly engaged in resisting what was looked upon as an impudent priestly encroachment as it now is in England. The occasion was this. While the town of Boston and the thriving and happy villages of New England were enjoying the institutions of the Christian religion under churches of their own establishment, and with pastors appointed by those who supported them and looked to them for spiritual help, this peaceful state of things was twice threatened in the years 1763 and 1767. An Episcopal society, formed in England for the charitable purpose of propagating the Gospel in benighted and destitute places, by a strange perversion of its object and its funds, sent hither some thirty missionaries of the Church of England, to establish their contentious ministers in places where the Gospel was already faithfully preached and generously sustained. The project was entertained of sending over a bishop of the English Church to set up his see here and to rule over the Lord's brethren. True to the instinct of freedom which is to be traced to the very first religious and political institutions established on this soil, our fathers at once steadily resisted this usurping design, and resisted it successfully. England has never planted her bishops here. Some fancy bishops of our own growth pursue their harmless circuits amid churches each of which recognizes its own pastor as a true evangelical bishop. In the brisk and ardent controversy which the intended usurpation called out here, the Rev. Dr. Mayhew, of the West Church in this city, a man of brilliant gifts, of a sound scholarship, and a most racy wit, sustained the cause of religious freedom against Archbishop Secker. Many of our readers must have seen in the libraries of their fathers a portrait of Dr. Mayhew, with the wreath of victory encircling his countenance, while a broken crosier and an overturned mitre indicate the nature of the strife in which he triumphed.

The intense excitement which for more than six months has prevailed among all classes in reference to the recent measure of the Pope, had not one whit abated at our last advices. It is founded upon the intelligent and well assured conviction, that the establishment of the Papal hierarchy in that Protestant realm is a circumstance of disastrous omen to religious liberty, to the supremacy of the civil law in civil matters, to the integrity of the courts of justice, and to the interests of education and progress. Three incidents, contemporaneous with the main cause of popular alarm, have served to inflame the "No Popery" feeling by materials which appeal most forcibly to the Protestant zeal of England; namely, the prohibition passed by the Synod of Thurles against the Parliamentary colleges established in Ireland for the free secular education of all classes; the case of Metaire against Wiseman, in which the charge of unlawful influence used by a Roman priest to obtain a bequest from a dying miser is at issue; and, third, an appeal of Mr. Berkeley in behalf of a step-daughter, a ward in chancery, who it is alleged is a *postulant* in a convent, and about to take the veil, thus committing to the priests her fortune of £80,000. The Roman Church is thus presented in three of its most odious as-

pects to the zealous Protestantism of all classes, while statesmen and bishops are careful to secure for the Papal aggression a complete discussion in all its bearings upon the honor and religion of the realm. The Prime Minister of Great Britain committed himself at the very opening of the excitement by a very free-spoken, indignant, and threatening expression of his feelings, in an unofficial, though public, letter to the Bishop of Durham. Of course, therefore, the opening of Parliament was looked forward to with lively interest, to test whether his official course would sustain his private ardor. The bill brought before the House of Commons prohibits, under a fine of £ 100 for each offence, the assumption of a territorial title by any ecclesiastic, not authorized by the civil power, — makes void any instrument executed by such an intruder, — and forbids the bequest of property into the care or use of any such ecclesiastic. Leave to introduce this bill was granted by a vote of 395 against 63. In the mean while, the ministry, being defeated on other measures, resigned, but returned to power after it was found impossible to organize another from the opposition or from factions. The bill, having been slightly modified, passed to a second reading by a very large majority, and though it fails to satisfy the nation at large, has been most passionately assailed by Roman Catholic members. Mr. Drummond allowed himself, in debate, some freedom of speech upon Roman Catholic practices, and a scene of confusion ensued resembling those which "Western members" sometimes enact in our own Congress.

The action of Parliament on this subject is beset with many embarrassments. In no other country of Europe, not even in those thoroughly Roman Catholic, is the Pope allowed to appoint territorial bishops. He has ventured to thrust them upon England and Ireland, on the plea that they are necessary to the perfection of the religious privileges of his adherents in that realm. It is difficult for us to see how England can withstand his exercise of this authority, — so long as any of her subjects are his subjects also. If there are those in England who choose to divide their allegiance between a temporal prince and a spiritual prince, how can they be restrained? The only feasible course would seem to be to strike at the root of the evil, and so to educate and train all her subjects, that no one among them would admit the right of the Bishop of Rome to look beyond his own rotten diocese for an enforcement of claims which can be sustained in appearance only among his own subjects, and only by French and Austrian bayonets even among them.

Our own Unitarian brethren in England, with but two or three exceptions, have opposed all Parliamentary action which should carry with it the slightest degree of intolerance. They think that the interests of religious liberty will finally be served by the Papal measure which seems to threaten them.

INDEX.

A.

- Academies, The, and Public High Schools of Massachusetts, Article on, 18-45 — Expenses of, 20-25 — Statistics of, 23 — Studies, Discipline, and Life in, 27-30 — Secularism in, 31 — Relative Value of, 33-45.
- Adam, Men before. Article on, 79-96.
- Adams, J. Q., his Efforts in behalf of the Observatory of Harvard University, 265.
- Agassiz, Prof. L., his Principles of Zoölogy, noticed, 359 — His Edition of Hugh Miller's Work, 143.
- Almanac, 'The American, for 1851, noticed, 145.
- Alton Locke, an Autobiography, noticed, 143.
- Andrews, Dr. E. A., his Edition of Freund's Lexicon, noticed, 352.
- Authon, Dr. C., his Classical Dictionary, noticed, 352.
- Atheism, as professed by Miss Martineau and H. G. Atkinson, 491.
- Athenæum, Boston, Pres. Quincy's History of, noticed, 355.
- Atkinson, H. G., his Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development, 489-502.

B.

- Batthyányi, 311.
- Beard, Dr. J. R., his Scriptural Works, 153.
- Bemis, George, his Report of the Case of Dr. Webster, 144.
- Bernard, St., Translation from, 53.
- Biblical Trinity, A, noticed, 140.
- Bigelow, John, his Jamaica in 1850, noticed, 134-138.
- Bond, Wm. C., and his Sons, their Connection with the Observatory of Harvard University, and their Discoveries, 266-279.
- Borrow, George, his Lavengro, noticed, 364, 504.
- Bowen, Charles J., his Ordination, 156.
- Burton, Warren, his District School as it was, noticed, 145.
- Bushnell, Horace, his Christ in Theology, noticed, 513.

C.

- Channing, Rev. W. H., his Memoir of James H. Perkins, reviewed, 157-174.
- Cheever, Rev. H. T., his Island World of the Pacific, noticed, 356.
- Chinese Proclamation against Christianity, 365.
- Cincinnati twenty years ago, 159.
- Clarke, Rev. S. F., his Centennial Discourse at Athol, noticed, 362.
- Comte, Auguste, his Cours de Philosophie Positive, reviewed, 174-202 — His Style and Method, 175 — His Experiences, 177 — Design and Spirit of the Work, 179-183 — Plan and Treatment, 185-193 — Views of Society and Science, 194 — His Religious Belief, 196-202.
- Contemplations of God in the Kosmos, 1-17.
- Cordner, Rev. John, his Sermons on Christ and the Trinity, noticed, 362.
- Craig, Rev. Austin, his Marks of the True Church, noticed, 362.
- Creation not Development, 3 — The Manifestation of Thought, 5 — God in Creation, 7-10 — Creation of Organized Beings, 11 — Distribution and Reproduction, 13-15.
- Creed, the Apostles', so called, 401.
- Cushing, Luther S., his Edition of Domat's Civil Law, noticed, 138.

D.

- Davis, Dr. Emerson, his History of the Half-Century, noticed, 355.
- Death and Life, the Christian Doctrine of, Article on, 429-449 — Physical Death, 439 — Origin of, 441 — Man subjected to it, 445.
- Dedication, 156.
- Domat, Jean, on the Civil Law, noticed, 138.

E.

- Edney, Richard, and the Governor's Family, a Tale, noticed, 140.
- Epidemics in Massachusetts, 387.
- Epidemic Monomania, Article on, 457-478 — Universal Delusions, 459 — Religious Delusions, 467 — Belief in Demoniactal Agency, 469.

- F.
- Faith, Justification by, Article on, 254 - 264.
- Forman, Rev. J. G., his Sermon on the Fugitive Slave Law, noticed, 360.
- G.
- Gannett, Rev. Dr., his Sermon on Thanksgiving for the Union, noticed, 360.
- Garland, Hugh A., his Life of John Randolph, noticed, 145.
- Gayarre, Charles, his History and Romance of Louisiana, noticed, 514.
- Gilfillan, George, his Bards of the Bible, noticed, 364.
- Goethe's Wilhelm Meister, noticed, 515.
- Gould, A. A., his Principles of Zoology, 359.
- Grote, George, a Reprint of his History of Greece, 363, 520.
- H.
- Hall, Rev. N., his Sermon on the Limits of Civil Obedience, noticed, 360.
- Hapsburg, the House of, 321.
- Harvard University, see *Observatory*.
- Hawthorne, Nath., his Twice-Told Tales, and House of the Seven Gables, noticed, 508.
- Hayward, A., his Translation of Goethe's Faust, noticed, 359.
- "He descended into Hell," Article on, 401 - 416 — Meaning of, 404 — Its Supposed Scriptural Authority, 408.
- High Schools, see *Academies*.
- Hillard, George S., his Address before the Mercantile Library Association, noticed, 147.
- Holland, Lord, his Foreign Reminiscences, noticed, 507.
- Howe, Rev. Nathaniel, his Century Sermon at Hopkinton, noticed, 516.
- Howe, Dr. S. G., his Reports on Idiocy, 103.
- Humboldt, William von, his Religious Thoughts and Opinions, 148.
- Hungarian, Protestants, The, 522.
- Hungary, Sketch of the Origin and Character of its recent Struggle, with an Examination of Authorities in reply to the North American Review, 279 - 352. — The Races of, 285. — Languages of, 288 - 294 — Invasion of, 303 - 309.
- I.
- Idiots, Dr. Howe's Reports to the Legislature of Mass. on the Training of, Article on, 103 - 133 — Action of the Legislature, 104 — Idiots in Europe, 107 - 114 — Massachusetts School for, 115 — Training of, 117 — Results of, 119 — Number of Idiots in Mass., 125.
- Indian Antiquities in North America, 417 - 428.
- Insanity, Forms of, 465 — Sympathetic, 471 - 474.
- Installation, 156.
- J.
- Jamaica in 1850, by John Bigelow, noticed, 134 - 138.
- Jane Bouverie, a Tale, reviewed, 478 - 489.
- Jellachich, Ban of Croatia, 297, 319, 351.
- Johnston, James F. W., his Notes on North America, noticed, 512.
- Justification by Faith, Article on, 254 - 264. — Doctrine of, in the Old Testament, 255. — St. Paul's, 257. — The Christian Doctrine, 261. — Illustrations of, 262 - 264.
- K.
- Kane, Thomas L., his Discourse on the Mormons, noticed, 363.
- Knox, Robert, on the Races of Men, noticed, 502.
- Kosmos, Contemplations of God in the, Article on, 1 - 17.
- L.
- Landor, W. S., his Popery, British and Foreign, noticed, 517.
- Lavater, Translation from, 54.
- Lavengro, by George Borrow, noticed, 364, 504.
- Lawrence Academy, 24.
- Life and Death, the Christian Doctrine of, Article on, 429 - 449 — Meaning of Scripture Words, 431 — Metaphorical Terms, 433 - 438.
- Lincoln, Prof. J. L., his Edition of Horace, noticed, 515.
- Lord, William W., his Poem, Christ in Hades, noticed, 506.
- Lycanthropy, or Wolf-Madness, 463.
- M.
- Mailáth, 317.
- Mansfield, E. D., on American Education, noticed, 146.

- Martineau, Harriet, her Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development, reviewed, 489-502 — Extracts, 491, 492 — Atheistic Basis of, 491 — Fallacies of, 495.
- Massachusetts, Report on the Sanitary Survey of, reviewed, with Extracts, 381-400 — Epidemics in, 387.
- M'Cosh on the Divine Attributes, noticed, 511.
- Men before Adam, Article on, 79-96.
- Mesmerism, a Pseudo Science, 497-500.
- Miller, Hugh, his Foot-Prints of the Creator, noticed, 143.
- Ministry, Vivality of the, 379.
- Monomania, Epidemic, Article on, 457-478.
- Montaigne, The Endless Study, and other Miscellanies, by Vinet, noticed, 142.
- Morgan, Lewis H., his League of the Iroquois, reviewed, 417-428.
- O.
- Observatory, the Astronomical, of Harvard University, Article on, 264-279 — Origin of, 265 — Instruments and Observations, 267 — The Great Refractor, 269 — Discoveries at, 271-276 — The Spring Governor, 277.
- Ordination, 156.
- P.
- Paget, John, on Hungary, 337.
- Papal Aggression in England, 524.
- Park, Prof. E. A., his Remarks on a Review of his Convention Discourse, 363.
- Parker, Rev. T., his Sermon on the State of the Nation, noticed, 360.
- Paul, St., on Justification by Faith, 259.
- Perkins, James H., Memoir and Writings of, reviewed, with Extracts, 157-174 — His Literary and Mercantile Life, 161 — Missionary, Teacher, and Preacher, 163 — His Character, 173.
- Peter, First Epistle of, iii. 19, 20, expounded, 409.
- Phrenology, a Pseudo Science, 493.
- Poetry, A Dark Morning, 46 — The Last of "The Strung Pearls," 47 — Longing after the Contemplation of the Invisible, 48 — *Jesu Dulcis Memoria*, 53 — "He must increase, but I must decrease," 54 — The Leipsic Tournament, 450 — The Loss of the Anio, 452 — In Memory of F. W. R., 456.
- Pope, The, 521.
- Possession, Demoniacal, 461.
- Preaching, and the Afternoon Service, Article on, 369-381 — Excess of Preaching, 370 — The Preacher's Task, 371 — His Experience, 373 — Evening Service, 375.
- Princeton Review, The, noticed, 517.
- Prospective Review, The, noticed, 518.
- Q.
- Quincey, Thomas De, his Miscellaneous Essays, 360 — His *Cæsars*, 506.
- Quincey, Josiah, his History of the Boston Athenæum, noticed, 355.
- R.
- Randolph, John, his Life, by H. A. Garland, noticed, 145.
- Reflections, 96-102.
- Review, North American, see *Hungary*.
- Rückert, Translation from, 47.
- S.
- Sanitary Survey of Massachusetts, 381.
- Schlesinger, Max, on Hungary, 345-349.
- Science and Theology, 201.
- Simms, W. G., his Poem at Magnolia Cemetery, noticed, 516.
- Sinclair, Catherine, her *Jane Bouverie*, reviewed, 478-489.
- Skinner, Rev. O. A., his Sermon on Duty to Government and to God, 360.
- Smith, Dr. William, his Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, 352.
- Socinianism, Sketch of, 221 — Unpopularity of, 225 — Relation to Unitarianism, 220.
- Socinians, Character of, 223.
- Socinus, Lælius, 209 — Faustus, 212 — His Life and Opinions, 213-215 — Death, 216 — His Influence, 217.
- Southey, Robert, his Life and Correspondence, by Rev. C. C. Southey, reviewed, 228-254 — General Character of the Work, 229 — Estimate of Southey, 231 — His Birth, 233 — Education, 234-238

- Marriages, 239 - 252 — Visits Portugal, 241 — Publications, 243 — Contributions to the Quarterly Review, 245 — Poet Laurate, 247 — Wat Tyler, 249 — His Politics, 251 — Death and Character, 253.
- Sprague, Charles, his Writings, noticed, 510.
- Squier, E. G., his Work on the Indian Antiquities of North America, 417 - 421.
- Strickland, Agnes, her Lives of the Queens of Scotland, 357.
- Sumner, Charles, his Orations and Speeches, 144.
- Sunday, the Uses and Capabilities of, Article on, 55 - 79 — The Jewish Sabbath, 57 — Anti-Sabbatariana, 59 — Sanction of Sunday, 61 — Conditions for Sunday, 65 - 68 — The Name of Sunday, 69 — Uses of Sunday, 71 — Rest, 73 — Improvement, 75 — Religious Uses, 77 — Services and Occupations, 377.
- Szechényi, 315.
- Szemere, Prime Minister, 346.
- T.
- Theology and Science, 201.
- Transylvania, 329.
- Tuckerman, H. T., his Poems, noticed, 509 — His Characteristics of Literature, noticed, 514.
- Turnbull, Robert, his Translations from Vinet, noticed, 142.
- U.
- Ujházy, Governor, 323.
- Unitarian Biography, American, by Rev. William Ware, noticed, 357.
- Unitarian Society, London District, 154.
- Unitarianism in the 16th and 17th Centuries, Article on, 202 - 228 — At the Reformation, 207 — In Italy, 209 — In Poland, 211 — Persecution of, 219 — Relation to Socinianism, 221 — And the Bible, 227.
- V.
- Vinet, Translations from, by Dr. Turnbull, 142.
- W.
- Wallace, Rev. Robert, his Antitrinitarian Biography, reviewed, 202 - 228. — His Plan, 203. — Merits of his Work, 205.
- Ware, Rev. W., his American Unitarian Biography, noticed, 357.
- Waverley Poetry, The, noticed, 356.
- Webster, Prof., Bemis's Report of his Case, 144.
- Wesselényi, 331.
- Whipple, E. P., his Essays and Reviews, 357.
- Willard, L., Translations from the French, 358.
- Willard, Dr. S., his Ethico-Political Tract, 516.
- Williams Dr. W. R., his Discourses on Religious Progress, noticed, 146.
- Williston Seminary, 25.
- Y.
- Yates, James, his Vindication of Unitarianism, 153.
- Yeoman, Dr. T. H., on Consumption, 148.
- Z.
- Zchokke, Translation from, 48.

This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

44010
CANCELLED
25 10
SEP 19 1981

SPALLS
JUL 6 1981
CHARGE
CANCELLED



WIDEN
BOOK DUE
JAN 1 1981
27957

